





Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2025

THE EXPOSITOR

VOL. XXV.

List of Contributors to Volume XXV

- REV. PROFESSOR HERBERT T. ANDREWS, D.D.
REV. E. H. ASKWITH, D.D.
REV. PRINCIPAL SYDNEY CAVE, D.D.
REV. PROFESSOR ARCHIBALD DUFF, M.A., LL.D., D.D.
REV. FRANK EAKIN, B.D., Ph.D.
REV. W. EWING, M.C., D.D.
REV. W. J. FERRAR, M.A.
H. J. FLOWERS, B.A., B.D.
THE LATE REV. PRINCIPAL P. T. FORSYTH, D.D.
REV. A. T. S. JAMES, M.A., M.Sc.
REV. J. H. LECKIE, D.D.
REV. G. H. C. MACGREGOR, M.A.
PROFESSOR J. R. MANTEY, THEOL.D.
REV. PROFESSOR D. S. MARGOLIOUTH, LITT.D., F.B.A.
PROFESSOR THEOPHILE JAMES MEEK, B.D., Ph.D.
REV. WILLIAM PIERSON MERRILL, D.D.
REV. PROFESSOR JAMES MOFFATT, D.D., LITT.D.
REV. A. D. MOZLEY, M.A.
JOHN P. NAISH, B.LITT., B.D.
REV. D. PLOOIJ, D.D.
REV. A. M. POPE, B.D.
EDITH ANNE ROBERTSON AND REV. PROFESSOR J. A. ROBERTSON.
REV. PROFESSOR G. A. JOHNSTON ROSS, D.D.
REV. W. HUEY STEELE, M.A.
REV. S. TONKIN, B.D.
REV. H. L. TOWNSEND, B.D.
REV. PROFESSOR ADAM C. WELCH, D.D.
REV. W. R. WHATELY, M.A.
THE LATE PROFESSOR OWEN C. WHITEHOUSE, D.D.
REV. CANON R. WINTERBOTHAM, M.A.
H. G. WOOD, M.A.

THE EXPOSITOR

EDITED BY THE REV.

SIR W. ROBERTSON NICOLL,
C.H., D.D., LL.D.

EIGHTH SERIES

Volume XXV



HODDER AND STOUGHTON
WARWICK SQUARE, LONDON, E.C.

MCMXXIII

504.8
V. 25
1923/1

Made and Printed in Great Britain.
Butler & Tanner, Frome and London

THE MESSIAH.¹

It is assumed by most of those who have written the life of Christ that when Christianity commenced there was throughout the Palestinian communities an expectation of a Messiah who was to be a King of the Jews and a world-conqueror ; there would seem to be no difference in this matter between conservative writers, liberal theologians, and ultra-radical authors, such as Drews. Thus the general theory of the work of Strauss is that certain miracles were expected of the Messiah, whence pious Christians fabricated the like and assigned them to Jesus. Orthodox theologians have repeatedly dealt with the Christology of the Old Testament, implying thereby that the Old Testament contained evidence of such an expectation, though there may be some differences of opinion as to the texts which evince it.

There are indeed in the Gospels passages which imply not only that such an expectation was current, but that men's minds were before the coming of Jesus thoroughly familiar with the idea of a Messiah and a system of beliefs connected with him. *Prima facie* there seems to be little variety between the four Gospels on this subject. Near the commencement of Matthew some astrologers infer from their art that a world-conqueror has been born in Judæa, and naturally go to the capital, assuming that he will be found in the royal palace. Herod, who with the rest of the inhabitants is disturbed by the news, knows that they mean the Messiah, and enquires of the religious authorities

¹ Paper read before the Oxford Society of Historical Theology.

where the Messiah is to be born. These authorities are possessed of a system of Messianic exegesis of prophecy, and so can answer Herod's question with ease and certainty. At the end of the Gospel, when Jesus is arrested, the High-priest asks Him if he is the Christ, the Son of God; clearly the High-priest awaits such a person, and wishes to know whether Jesus claims to be that person. In another scene Jesus asks the Pharisees whose son they suppose the Messiah to be, and they reply, "The Son of David." They are refuted from a text which is agreed to be Messianic. In the Third Gospel (iii. 15), when John the Baptist comes forward, the people wonder whether he is the Christ; and in the Fourth Gospel he disclaims the title when interrogated by a deputation from Jerusalem. In John vii. 26-42 some of the people in Jerusalem assert that Jesus is the Christ, and reasons for and against the identification are quoted. According to ix. 22 men were to be excommunicated for giving Him the title; and in xii. 34 the crowd quote what the Law says about the Christ. This Gospel goes somewhat further than the others in making the Samaritans—including the women—share the expectation.¹ Further, it ostensibly gives the Hebrew word of which *Christos* is a translation. The other Gospels are satisfied with the Greek word.

Elsewhere in the New Testament it appears to be the problem of the missionary to demonstrate that Jesus is the Christ; and this assumes that the Jews not only in Palestine but throughout the Dispersion expected a Messiah.

If we turn from the Gospels to that Jewish literature which is later than the fall of Jerusalem, and which, having been preserved by the Jews themselves, is unlikely to have been interpolated by Christians, we find that it to a great extent shares the Christian conception of a Messiah. The assertion

¹ H. Hammer, *Traktat vom Samaritanermessias*, 1913, produces evidence to show that the Samaritans did not expect one.

is even made - quite in accordance with the New Testament - that the Messiah is the subject of all the prophecies. In the Targum of Micah the text quoted in Matthew for the birthplace of the Messiah exhibits the same exegesis. Indeed the Targums mention the Messiah very frequently; Elias Levita collected a number of such passages: Buxtorf claims to have added to them, but even his list appears to be incomplete. In general it may be stated that the Jews of this period agree with the Christians about the promise of a Messiah, but differ about the person in whom the promise was to be realised. The conquering Messiah is at times called the Son of David; it does not appear that in this literature he is given the title Son of God.

If however we turn to the authoritative literature of the Jews which preceded the New Testament—the meaning of this adjective will presently appear—we find little to confirm the theory of such an expectation. Ecclesiasticus, which is ostensibly pre-Maccabæan, awaits the return of Elijah (xlviii. 10) on the faith of a prophecy of Malachi; but Elijah in this text is himself to discharge the task of the Messiah, for he is “to restore the tribes of Jacob,” the consummation for which the author prays so fervently in chapter xxxiii. That this is the task of the Messiah Himself, and not of his forerunner, appears clearly from Acts i. 6. If then the work is, as the Greek preface asserts, a translation from a Hebrew work of about 200 B.C., by an inhabitant of Jerusalem, we may infer that the Palestinian expectation at that time was of Elijah, not of the Messiah. The argument will only increase in strength if from the evident employment of Philonic exegesis in xliv. 16 we regard the whole work as later than Philo, and so nearly contemporary with the New Testament.

If we proceed from this book to the Maccabæan histories, where not only the expectation, but the realisation of the

Messiah might well be sought, we find neither. In 1 Maccabees the arrival of a prophet is regarded as likely, but only for the purpose of solving legal difficulties.¹ His function is then similar to that which the Samaritan woman in the Fourth Gospel assigns to the Messiah, "who will reveal all things." Judas the Maccabee, who was High-priest, or Hyrcanus, who according to Josephus was "prophet, priest and king," might well have claimed to fulfil the expectation of a Messiah, had one been expected; but the title is not given them. Indeed the historians of the Maccabees seem to cherish even less expectation than Ben-Sira. The "restoration of the kingdom to Israel" has come about, but they do not connect it with ancient prophecies, nor identify any of the heroes of the rising with "him of whom the prophets did speak." What they expect when things are looking black is divine intervention, angels and the like; what they console themselves with, when these expedients fail, is the future life.

Josephus quite certainly knows nothing of an expected Messiah. This historian has numerous opportunities of mentioning the belief, had there been one; his silence can only be explained on the supposition that he was unacquainted with it. The notion that he purposely concealed it for fear of offending his Roman masters is not worth refuting. The pages of his Jewish War may be said to teem with notices of false prophets and pretenders; several of the latter arose at the troublous period which followed on the death of Herod, when his descendants fought for the succession in Rome; others showed themselves in the last days of the Jewish state. Now if there had been an expectation of a Messiah with a Messianic interpretation of prophecy, it would have been almost impossible for the historian to avoid stating that some at least of these impos-

¹ iv. 46.

tors claimed to satisfy the conditions which that exegesis supplied, e.g., to have been born in Bethlehem of Davidic descent, and showing that these claims were mendacious. But though in reference to the events of this period he cites prophecies to be found in the Old Testament as well as some which are not there, he gives no hint of any promised Messiah or of any person having truly or falsely claimed to be the fulfilment of such a promise.

It must further be noticed that Josephus expounds the views of the Jewish sects with some detail, and the occasion which he seizes in the Jewish War is when a certain Judas of Gaulan proclaimed the doctrine that tribute must not be paid to a foreign ruler. Now the expectation of a Messiah, if it existed, must have entered into the doctrines of one or more of these sects: it must have powerfully affected the exegesis of that Scripture which formed their common ground. It must have dictated the attitude of those who held it towards the existing régime; whether accepted or rejected it would have entered into the system of the sect. In the accounts of these sects furnished by Josephus it is simply ignored. No, too, in his account of the Baptist, Josephus goes out of his way to contradict the notion that the baptism was for the forgiveness of sins: but he does not contradict the notion that the Baptist claimed to be the forerunner of the Messiah. The inference to be drawn seems to be that Josephus had never heard of this claim, or, if he knew of it, that it conveyed no meaning to him.

Similar silence is observed by Philo, to whose evidence less importance is to be attached, as his life was spent away from Palestine.

Now a question which arises is whether there was not an official known as the Messiah down to the end of the Jewish state. In Exodus xxx. 23 a formula is given for the manufacture of an ointment to be used in the consecration of

priests ; and the anointing of the High-priest is repeatedly emphasised. Reference is made to the matter by Josephus¹ and Philo.²

But did this anointing of the High-priest continue ? The Talmudic tradition asserts that it lasted no longer than the time of Josiah, who ordered the ointment which had remained from the time of Moses to be put away.³ The Mishnah distinguishes between the priest anointed with the oil of unction and the priest who is exalted (consecrated) by his garments⁴; and this is supposed to be a distinction between the high-priests who were before the time of Josiah and those who came after. It is true that the clothes of the High-priest were of such importance that in Roman times the Roman governor had them in his charge ; and that references to the anointing of priests in post-exilian times are not quite easy to find. Still in 2 Maccabees i. 10 a letter is addressed to Aristobulus in Egypt, who is described as “ of the family of the anointed priests,” and it would seem more likely that this meant “ of the high-priestly family ” than that it meant “ of the priests before Josiah’s time.”

On the whole the evidence in favour of the high-priests having been anointed till the end of the Jewish state seems conclusive. In Daniel ix. 26 “ the anointed one shall be cut off ” most probably means “ the high-priesthood shall cease ” ; “ the anointed prince ” is distinguished from “ the prince.” Josephus supposes Judas the Maccabee to have assumed the high-priesthood when the Temple had been cleansed ; and if the documents which he quotes are genuine, this must have happened. If the question be asked : Supposing him to have been anointed on this occasion, who performed the ceremony ?—it may be answered that this same difficulty occurs elsewhere. In Numbers xxxv.

¹ *Ant.* III. viii. § 3.

² *Life of Moses*, iii. 17.

³ *B. Horayoth*, 12a.

⁴ *B. Megillah* i. § 9.

25 we read "till the death of the high-priest, whom he shall anoint with the holy oil"; the LXX. with "whom they have anointed" makes this matter no clearer. In Leviticus vi. 15 "the priest anointed in his stead from his sons" the same difficulty is evaded.

If the current theory be sound, that most of this legislation is post exilic—and indeed one of the arguments for this is based on the passage cited last but one, where the death of the high-priest has the same effect as the death of the king in other communities—it seems reasonable to suppose that the rules about the ointment were based on post-exilic usage, though projected into an earlier period. And the Oral Tradition furnishes some details about the anointing which point to its continuance till a late date. The operation was said to be twofold: pouring oil on the head, and anointing between the eyebrows; there was a difference of opinion as to the order. The anointing was in the form of a Greek χ .¹ This Greek χ would be most naturally interpreted as the initial letter of $\chi\rho\iota\sigma\tau\acute{o}\varsigma$ meaning "anointed." If this be so, the Jewish people had a Messiah, or at any rate a $\chi\rho\iota\sigma\tau\acute{o}\varsigma$, till the destruction of the last Temple. Hence a Messiah would not up to that date be awaited; there was a Messiah already.

Had there been any Messianic interpretation of prophecy in the ordinary sense, we should reasonably expect that the fulfilment of it would be claimed for Herod the Great by his eulogists. For under him the Jewish state attained an extension and importance such as it had not had for about a thousand years. In external warfare Herod was nearly always victorious, and as the builder of the Temple he rivalled the glories of Solomon. It has been thought that he aimed at playing the part of a Mithradates, and founding a great Eastern empire which was to be independent of Rome.

¹ *Horayoth*, l.c.; *Krithoth* 5b.

His lavish benefactions to Greek communities had, it has been conjectured, the object of preparing for a struggle with the great Western power by securing the goodwill of its Hellenic or Hellenised subjects. If there had been any general expectation of a Jewish world-conqueror, Herod's flatterers would have surely pointed to him as the realisation of it. And, one fancies, he would have cured the nation of such an ambition; for at his death the Jews desired to become a Roman province, and a few years later their wish was granted. If the Messiah's function was "to restore the kingdom to Israel," this had been done by Herod, and the result was not such as to make the Jews continue to harbour the hope. There was indeed a home-rule party headed by Judas the Gaulanite: but their ideal was theocracy. This sect followed a principle, not a person: and in the disastrous War of Independence, which Josephus charges this sect with bringing about, the title Messiah is not mentioned in connexion with the leaders, whom the historian is not inclined to spare.

What has been emphasised hitherto is the difference of the atmosphere which is found in the Gospels from that of the authoritative Jewish literature which precedes them. In the Gospels it would appear that every Palestinian had the thought of a Messiah so prominent in his mind that any admirable performance would suggest to him that its author was the Messiah. In the Jewish pre-Christian literature the thought of a Messiah is so remote that even the most suitable personages are not identified with him. In the Gospels the audience of John the Baptist are prepared to give him the title; in the authorities of Josephus it is not given to Judas Maccabaeus or Herod the Great.

The word authoritative has been emphasised in the preceding discussion, because, if we extend our survey to works which have no right to that title, this generalisation must

be modified. Messianism—not indeed identical with that of the New Testament—is to be found in the Book of Enoch, to which considerable attention has been given in recent times. That work cannot be called authoritative, as the Jews knew nothing of it, and it has been mainly preserved in a veritable backwater of Christianity, the Abyssinian Church. We have, however, to recognise that a quotation from a Book of Enoch occurs in the Epistle of St. Jude, and that this text is actually found in the Ethiopic Book. The Messiah in this work is called, as in the Gospels, “the Son of Man,” and He is to sit on the throne of the Most High and judge quick and dead. In the vision which depicts some sort of triumph of Israel (?) neither the Messiah nor the Son of Man is mentioned by name, whence it is far from clear that the author of the work conceived of a Messiah who was to “restore the kingdom to Israel.”

Still the resemblance between the Messianism of Enoch and that of the Gospels is far too close to permit of our regarding the two as independent : whence it is necessary to form some sort of idea of the origin and date of the work as we have it. Now among the contents of the work is an astronomical system, which has been studied by an expert in that subject.¹ This lady calls attention to the fact that the system of Enoch has nothing Jewish about it—no reference to the Sabbath or to any Jewish feast ; and she also shows remarkable similarities between it and the system of the Bundahish, a Pehlevi compilation of the middle of the first century of our era. It agrees with the supposition that Enoch derives its astronomy from this source that the only enemies whom it knows by name are the Medes and Parthians. It may be added that Greek was the official language of the latter.

Now the author must have had some reason for ascribing

¹ Mrs. W. Maunder, *Transactions of the Victoria Institute*, 1915, p. 223.

his work to Enoch and it is difficult to see why any Jew should do this ; for Judaism begins with Moses, and traces its claim upon Canaan to Abraham ; what precedes Abraham has archæological value only. In the Pauline doctrine the Gentiles are admitted to the New Covenant on the ground that Abraham was to be the father of many nations ; but this theory has the inconvenience that the observance of the Abrahamic rite was to be rejected. The author of Enoch by ascribing his revelation to a patriarch who preceded Abraham gets rid of this inconvenience ; and to the Law of Moses he has no more than a faint allusion.

That the Ethiopic text is translated from Greek seems to be ascertained from a comparison of it with the fragments of the latter which we possess. It is ordinarily assumed that the Greek is a translation of Hebrew ; but the evidence of this is scarcely adequate. A passage which should help us is lxxvii. 1, 2, where the etymology of the points of the compass is given. *The first wind is called the East because it is the first.* For this we require a language wherein *East* and *first* bear some resemblance to each other. They bear none whatever in Hebrew ; but in the Jewish Aramaic, where *first* is קדמא and *East* קדום, the etymology will work. *The second is called the South, because the Most High descends there, and there in quite a special sense He who is blessed for ever comes down.* It must be rather a remarkable language wherein the South is called the place of going down ! *The West is called the Deficient, because there all the stars of heaven fail and go down.* As Dr. Charles remarks, we should expect “the third is called the West.” It seems likely that in these two cases the words employed for the points of the compass belonged to some magical vocabulary, whence we can infer nothing ; the ordinary Aramaic equivalents do not admit of these etymologies except by violent measures.

At the commencement of chapter lxxviii. we are told that the Sun has two names and the Moon four. Halévy conjectured Hebrew originals for these names, but his conjectures were wild. They may belong to some unknown language or they may be gibberish: the latter theory is not improbable. The author's powers of inventing names are strained when he has to give those of twenty-one evil angels: he evidently knows that angels' names should terminate in *el*, but (unless all the lists, which certainly differ widely, are corrupt) seems to have taken little trouble to make the first element a Hebrew word. In chapter lxi. there is a further set of names of "chiefs of evil angels"; the matter of this whole section reads like a treatise on magic. Angel No. 4 has a name *Penemu'*, which is perhaps the Greek *πνεῦμα*, "spirit": No. 5 has to do with mischievous spells, and is named *Kasdeya*; there seems no difficulty about identifying him with the Aramaic כַּסְדִּיָּא, "Chaldees," i.e. magicians.

Now in the Gospels we seem to see the history of the title Son of Man, which begins as a periphrasis for the first person singular, similar to others that are employed in Oriental languages: from its use in the speeches attributed to Jesus Christ it comes to be used specially of Him.

Since there is no evidence that this book ever existed in either Hebrew or Aramaic, and since Philo and Josephus are absolutely unacquainted with its existence, it is unsafe to find the source of the phrase "Son of Man" as applied to the Messiah here, when the usage of the Gospels indicates that that usage developed in another way. Indeed, in Matthew xxvi. 64 (= Mark xiv. 64) the statement of the Saviour, *Henceforth ye shall see the Son of Man sitting at the right hand of power*, could only be described as sheer blasphemy on the supposition that *the Son of Man* was the equivalent of *Me*; otherwise it would be no more than a

citation from the Book of Enoch, which might then be branded as unorthodox, but would in any case be responsible for the assertion.

Leaving then this work out of account, as of uncertain date and origin, we may sum up our present results as follows. With Ben-Sira Elijah is the person who is to restore the tribes of Israel; and in the historical works which have come down to us and chronicle Palestinian history from the Maccabæan rising to the destruction of the Temple there is no allusion to the expectation of a Messiah. And, what is of no less importance, there is no evidence that any claimant who arose during that period took the title Messiah or Christ—except the Founder of Christianity. When we read in modern works that Josephus speaks of pseudo-Messiahs, verification of the references shows that he is misquoted.

If we now turn back to the Gospels we find that there is at least one narrative in which the theory of the expectation of a Messiah seems to be abandoned. In Matthew xvi. 14, when opinions are collected concerning Jesus, they are found to be that He is John the Baptist, Elias, Jeremias or one of the Prophets. When Peter gives it as his opinion that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God, this is said to be a special revelation, which no man could have originated, and the disciples are forbidden to communicate it to any one. This would indicate that the Palestinians were expecting John the Baptist, Elias, etc., but were not expecting "the Christ, the Son of God." In John vii. 41 on the other hand, after hearing the words of Jesus, some said, "This is of a truth the Prophet, others said this is the Christ." Similarly in the same Gospel i. 25, when the Baptist is asked who he is, he begins by asserting that he is not the Christ, and in reply to further questions denies that he is Elias or the Prophet (promised in Deuteronomy). It is difficult not to recognise

in this discrepancy an advance in the nature of the expectations harboured by the Jewish people. In the earlier account the opinions quoted are not very different from what we should expect on the evidence of Ben-Sira and the Maccabees. Elijah was expected and a prophet was expected; and indeed according to 2 Maccabees xv. 14 Judas Maccabæus received a sword from the prophet Jeremiah in a dream, so that his reappearance would not be surprising. But the appearance of a Messiah was not yet awaited, because there was already a Messiah in the person of the High-priest.

In another sense *Χριστός* would seem to be a surname whereby Jesus was distinguished from namesakes of whom there were many. This is in Matthew xxvii. 17, 22, where Pilate asks whether he is to release Barabbas or Jesus "who is called Christ." It is difficult to reconcile this with xvi. 14, where this title is known to Peter by special revelation, and is not to be communicated to any one. Mark (xv. 9, 12) substitutes for "Christ" "king of the Jews," the title for assuming which Jesus was condemned (Matt. xxvii. 37); and which according to the Third Gospel (xxiii. 2) is the equivalent of "Christ." In Matthew then Pilate uses the name Christ as a distinctive of Jesus; in Mark "king of the Jews" is substituted for it; in Luke the accusers explain to Pilate that the two mean the same.

The use of *Christos* as a distinctive or alternative name is, it may be observed, found in the two passages of the *Antiquities* of Josephus where there is a reference to the Saviour. In the famous Testimony, after describing Jesus the author says: *He was the Christ*. This means, as the sequel shows, "He was the person after whom the Christian sect, not yet extinct, is called." The words of Josephus are thus similar to those of Tacitus: *Arctor eius nominis Christus*; only Josephus is aware that Christus is not the name but the distinctive. Josephus, or his interpolator, does not offer

any explanation of the title, nor state that it is a translation from the Hebrew; without the Gospels we should suppose that it was either a distinctive, such as was necessary when the same name was shared by numerous persons, in which case it might be either Hebrew or Greek in origin; or else an alternative name, such as we find adopted by Jews and others who had to associate with Greeks. "Jesus the High-priest called himself Jason, and Onias was called Menelaos."¹ "Alkimos was called Iakimos."² "Salome was called by the Greeks Alexandra."³ These cases are not perfectly parallel, since in two familiar Greek names are adopted, and in two the Greek name bears some resemblance to the Hebrew. In Acts i. 23 we have an example of a distinctive followed by an alternative: *Joseph called Barsabas with additional name Justus*. The alternative name would, of course, not be Hebrew, but either Greek or Latin.

The Gospels offer some suggestions for the interpretation of the name *Christos* as a distinctive or alternative name, without reference to an anticipated Messiah in the ordinary sense attributed to that word. The first of these is in Luke iv. 18, where it and the phrase "the Gospel" are both referred to Isaiah lxi. 1, where the speaker says that he has been *anointed to give good tidings to the poor*. "Anointed" means here *commissioned*; and the same interpretation appears in Acts x. 38: "God anointed Him with Holy Spirit and power," since the passage of Isaiah commences "the Spirit of the Lord Jehovah is upon me." The same reference underlies the question addressed by John the Baptist from his prison; for it is one of the functions assigned to the Person mentioned by Isaiah to announce the release of prisoners.

This interpretation has much about it that is attractive.

¹ Josephus, *Antiq.* XII. iv. § 1.

² XII. ix. § 7.

³ XIII. xii. § 1.

It explains at once the names *Christ* and *Gospel*. The former means the Person commissioned to announce the latter; and we may even find the origin of the name *Apostle* in the same text, since the words *he hath anointed me* are followed by *he hath sent me*. The "good tidings" in the original reference of Isaiah seem clearly to be of the release from Babylon; and the persons to whom the announcement is to be made are, according to the Hebrew and Syriac, "the humble," i.e. the oppressed, for which the LXX. substitutes "the poor." The *Lewisian* text of Matthew xi. 5 omits the words "the poor have good tidings preached to them," whence we cannot tell whether in this matter we should find the foundation in the Hebrew, the Syriac or the Greek.

A second suggestion is to be found in the narratives of Jesus being actually anointed. Such a narrative is introduced into all four Gospels, but the discrepancies are considerable. In Matthew xxvi. 7 a woman who has an alabaster of precious ointment pours it over the Saviour's head; and the same is narrated by Mark xiv. 3-9 with the additions that she smashed the alabaster and (evidently) emptied the contents. In John xii. 3 the woman is identified with Mary, sister of Lazarus, the quantity of ointment is given as one litre, and the ointment is poured over the *feet*. In all these accounts the incident comes near the close of the career. In Luke vii. 37 it takes place far earlier, the woman is said to have been a "sinner," and she brings an alabaster of ointment, out of which she anoints the feet.

The incident has been compared with a Talmudic passage, where it is stated that at weddings, where the bride was being married for the first time, the women poured oil on the heads of the learned.¹ This, however, is said to have been a Babylonian, not a Palestinian custom.

As is so often the case, the account in the First Gospel

¹ B. *Kethuboth* 17b.

seems to be original, and the others corrections of it. The substitution of the feet for the head is probably out of reverence; the anointing of the feet is, however, a practice attested by Athenaeus. The same author tells a story of Antiochus Epiphanes ordering a *ὄδρίσκη* containing more than two *χόες* of thick *μύρον* (ointment) to be poured over a man's head.¹ Mr. E. R. Bevan's rendering of this—"He ordered a vessel of choice myrrh to be broken on the man's head"²—bears a similar relation to the passage of Athenaeus to that which the account of Mark bears to that of Matthew; only Mark does not confuse "ointment" with "myrrh."

What all four Gospels indicate is that the incident attracted attention. One reason for this would be that the Essenes, whose doctrines bore some resemblance to the Christian, forbade the use of oil;³ the reader would therefore have expected this act to have brought a rebuke, whereas it was commended.

The preservation of this narrative may then be due to the desire to furnish an explanation of the name *Christos* for those who were as yet unfamiliar with the theological explanation. Incidents which explain the origin of distinctive names are common in Oriental and other historians; that such an incident should be placed late in the career is surprising, but not unknown. I have a letter from the late Dean Farrar, asking my opinion about the sense of the distinctive Auaran of Eleazar (1 Macc. vi. 43): "Does it," he asked, "mean 'the beast-sticker' with reference to his heroic death, which took place when he 'stuck' the elephant?" The notion, however, that the anointing came too late to serve as the origin of the distinctive *Christos*

¹ P. 438 f.

² *House of Seleucus*, ii. 130.

³ Josephus, *B.J.* II. viii. § 3.

would account for its removal in the Third Gospel to an earlier period, which would avoid this difficulty.

To the Hebrew it is likely that the word for "anoint" would be so intimately associated with the notion of commissioning that he would not require a literal explanation, any more than when we use the word "invest" we think of an actual uniform or robe of honour. Outside the Hebrew language the two ideas seem to have no such close connexion; hence when a distinctive or alternative name meant "Anointed," it would be natural that some actual unction would be recorded and supposed to furnish the occasion for the appellation.

Even if we do not accept the suggestion that the name *Χριστός* was given in commemoration of this event, it might still mean "the non-ascetic" as opposed to the asceticism of the Baptist. In Matthew vi. 17 the person who means to fast is told to anoint his head in order that it may be supposed that he has no such intention; and the maxim in Ecclesiastes ix. 8, "Let not thy head lack ointment," means "avoid asceticism."

To the use of anointing as a ceremony of initiation there is little reference in the New Testament, though such is found by some in 2 Corinthians i. 21 and 1 John ii. 20. In the Acts of Thomas, which contains some early matter, it has great prominence. In the Greek texts baptism is either omitted, or subordinated to the anointing. The converts say: "We understand that the God whom thou preachest recognises His sheep by His seal";¹ and they ask to be sealed. The Apostle asks for oil and seals them with it; before they are fully initiated they have to receive *τὸ ἐπισφράγισμα τῆς σφραγίδος*, "the oversealing of the seal," and this consists of oil poured over their heads. The resemblance of this to the double ceremony of the Talmud is very striking.

¹ Ed. Lipsius, 141, 17.

The seal itself would be likely to present a definite mark, like the Talmudic χ , whereas the second ceremony was simply pouring oil on the head.

Probably each of these explanations could only claim to be hypothetical; for the reason of a particular distinctive or alternative name is often forgotten beyond recovery. It is to be remarked that the Greek word $\chiριστός$ outside the LXX. was used rather of the ointment than of the person anointed; and Aquila is said to have preferred $\etaλειμμερος$ for the משיח of the Old Testament. Some authors endeavour to distinguish between the verbs whence these words are derived; but it is far from clear what the difference is. Nor are we able to settle whether as applied to the Founder of Christianity the Greek is a translation of the Hebrew or the Hebrew of the Greek. Josephus, as has been seen, does not exhibit acquaintance with the Hebrew form; and in the Greek Gospels it is the Fourth wherein it first appears; and even here it is rather the Aramaic than the Hebrew which is reproduced.

It is, however, of importance that "the disciples were first called $\chiριστιανοί$ at Antioch." Philostratus says of that city that it had no Hellenic interest; and this form is hybrid, being a Greek word with a Latin termination, probably introduced into Greek at the time of the war between Caesar and Pompey, when their respective partisans were known as Caesariani and Pompeiani. It has a parallel in the Gospels in the form Herodiani. If the Jews in general were looking to a Christos, they were all "Christians." The name would be more appropriate to the followers of one whose name rather than whose title it was.

Theological import could soon be found for it in the numerous passages of the Old Testament in which there is a reference to "the Lord's Anointed," of which one of the most utilised was the Second Psalm. It seems, however,

unlikely that the expectation spread from the Christians to the Jews so long as the latter had a Messiah in the person of their High-priest. There are even hints in the Gospels and Acts that the Messianic interpretation of prophecy is not pre-Christian. "As yet they knew not the Scriptures." The Ethiopian proselyte in the Acts has no notion of the reference of Isaiah liii. : he thinks the Prophet is speaking of himself. If we had any pre-Christian exegesis of the Psalms, it would probably be found that Psalms ii., xlv., and cix. were interpreted of David and Solomon. But during the years which preceded the fall of Jerusalem a Messianic exegesis had been developing among the Christians, and there was ample consolation therein for the Jews when their state had been ruined and their Temple burned. They might not accept the identification of the Messiah, but they were prepared to agree that one had been promised. It is asserted that the adventurer Bar-Cochba, 132-135 A.D., took the title Messiah. Since we hear of no Messiah before Jesus, it is reasonable to suppose that the Christian exegesis of the Old Testament is what has made the difference.

If this be so, it would follow that the discussions in the Gospels on the subject of the Messiah, as a concept familiar to Jews and Samaritans, were projections from a later period. This, however, is already implied by the passage wherein the Messiahship of Jesus is said to have been specially revealed to Peter, and a secret to be kept from all but the disciples. It is not possible to reconcile that narrative with those wherein the people are discussing whether Jesus is or is not the Messiah, some affirming and some denying.

If the results of this inquiry are in the main negative, they are positive to this extent, that they are quite irreconcilable with the ultra-negative view according to which the Founder of Christianity is not Himself a historical

character. That view assumes that the name Christ was originally functional, whence it might have been taken by many persons, who in the centuries before the Gospel claimed to be called to lead the Israelitish nation to victory and empire ; but the true view, which is alone in accord with chronology, is that the name belongs to one Person, otherwise known as Jesus ; it is a sect called after Him which first is known as Christian, and the very form of this word bears, as has been seen, evidence of its date. Further, the difference between the pre-Christian and the post-Christian literature of the Jews finds its explanation in the fact that with Jesus the title *Christos* first acquired theological value : when the expectation of a Messiah had been found by the Christians to pervade the Old Testament, and the destruction of the Jewish state by the Romans rendered such an expectation with the accompanying exegesis of Scripture plausible to the Jews, the latter adopted the Messianic hope, though they rejected the spiritual application which Christianity had developed.

It does not follow that the Messianic exegesis of the prophecies and Psalms should be rejected : it must, however, be remembered that Isaiah asserts emphatically that he will not be understood, and of the disciples we are told that "as yet they knew not the Scriptures." What our authorities rather indicate is that there was no pre-Christian Messianic exegesis, and so that there was no expectation of a Messiah.

The date at which this Messianic exegesis was developed as we find it in the Gospel is to be inferred from the date of the First Gospel. That work starts with the proof that the coming of Christ synchronised with the commencement of the seventh heptad of generations from Abraham. Now Josephus at the close of the Jewish War asserts that Jerusalem had been founded by Melchisedek and lasted 2,177

years till it was taken by Titus. If a generation be supposed to equal fifty years, the commencement of the seventh heptad will be in the year of Abraham (contemporary of Melchisedek) 2101, or 7 B.C. In E. W. Fischer's *Römische Zeit-tafeln* we read that this is the date which eminent authorities have assigned the Birth of Christ, doubtless owing to the fact that the death of Herod took place three years later.

For the chronology it seems reasonable to hold Josephus responsible; and that the number 7 enters into his calculation is evident. In the Gospel it is again employed so that the Birth of Christ commences the seventh group of seven generations; the interpretation of the latter as Jubilees is remarkable, but not in the circumstances unreasonable. From the nature of the case—the calculation having for its basis the Fall of Jerusalem—this chronology must be taken from the Jewish War of Josephus. Hence the Gospel is later than that work. There was ample time for the belief that a Messiah had always been expected to arise.

D. S. MARGOLIOUTH.

THE APOSTOLIC DECREE AND ITS PROBLEMS.

(a) THE CHARACTER OF THE CONFLICT.

THE Apostolic Council and the problems connected with it, are still the centre of every study of the history of Apostolic Christianity, and there is no topic of discussion of New Testament problems which for so long a time has been the subject of so much special research. The pages of this Magazine, which are so widely open for discussion of New Testament problems, afford abundant proof of this fact, and the words in which Weizsäcker half a century ago characterised the position have lost nothing of their significance: "In the entire history of apostolic Christianity

there is no second moment which for the understanding of it is of so fundamental importance as the so-called Apostolic Council."

It is remarkable that notwithstanding all these efforts nothing like an agreement has yet been obtained and that the solutions of the different problems diverge almost in every direction. This is even more remarkable because we may say that the historical evidence relative to the subject is as excellent as perhaps any other point of New Testament studies can afford. Luke's narrative of the simple facts themselves and Paul's autobiographical data and his exposition of the great principles lying at the basis of the controversy, each taken by itself, afford first-rate information and may be regarded as trustworthy witnesses in a high degree. It is true that until very recently Luke has been disqualified as an author on early Jewish Christianity and on the relations between the parties in Palestine;¹ but this judgment is based almost exclusively on inferences drawn from the Pauline letters and a remnant of Old-Tübingen reconstruction of history. But even if we reject Luke on account of his divergency from Paul, we have not yet done with his narrative, which must be explained even if rejected. There is, however, an increasing number of scholars who do not feel so easy about this traditional Tübingen thesis, and who regard Luke's work as an invaluable and in general quite trustworthy account of facts; only the narrative must be recognised in its own character.

The letter to the Galatians was written in a moment of the greatest excitement and anxiety, of which even its

¹ By Anton Fridrichsen, *Die Apologie des Paulus Gal. i.* (in *Paulus und die Urgemeinde*), Giessen, 1921, S. 74. Cf. on this (and on the other study by Lyder Brun, *Apostelkonzil und Aposteldekret*, contained in the same brochure): Prof. James Moffatt in the *Expositor* for July, 1921. (viii. 22), pp. 69-80.

style bears the marks. Still, there is in it a keen desire to be painfully exact, and Paul had every reason for being as accurate as possible as the slightest deviation from complete and simple truth would expose him to further and more dangerous calumnies. Even in such seemingly insignificant details as whether on a certain occasion he had seen in Jerusalem any apostle, he adds to his statement of the fact the words : " Before God I assert that I do not lie." Accordingly, whatever may be the *explanation* of the facts recorded by Paul or whatever may be the light thrown upon them, either by Paul or by his opponents, we must take them to be materially correct, and we have to accept them as trustworthy.

On the other hand Luke's narrative has been written at a distance of time (how long we may leave undecided) which at all events had effaced the sharper points of the controversy. We may go further still. Within a score of years the Gentile element in the Christian Church had outgrown the Jewish Christians to such a degree that the controversy became meaningless in so far as the offence to the Jews and the *practical* difficulties at the time of the Council were involved. It seems to me to be of prime importance to recognise that the Council was necessary and was possible only at the critical time of transition when the Gentile element began to be an influential part of the early Church and when its influence began to be felt. So far I see no real objection to the narrative of Luke. I believe with many scholars that Luke's narrative of the Council is not the account of an eyewitness ; it does not claim to be so ; but that Luke has had excellent first-hand information and that he has used it conscientiously. At all events, most objections to the trustworthiness of Luke do not arise from arguments derived from his own work, but from comparison with Paul's letter to the Galatians,

and especially from a parallelisation of a portion of it (Gal. ii. 1-10 with Acts xv.), a parallelisation which in itself is mere hypothesis.

I am afraid that this latter word may sound daring in the ears of many scholars, especially of those of the old school. That in Gal. ii. 1-10 the Pauline account is given of what Luke describes in Acts xv. has been for scores of years the axiomatic basis of discussion, almost without a single exception. And it has become a "noli me tangere" of New Testament research. Even if the hypothesis were less objectionable than it is, it might be useful to remind ourselves that it is an "hypothesis" and nothing more. And with a view to the remarkable fact, just mentioned, that the narrative of each of the two sources, taken by itself, would hardly give rise to difficulties of a serious kind, and that it is mainly their parallelisation in the way mentioned which causes many scholars to reject the Lukan narrative, I should think there is place for the question whether the starting point is right.

In a recent article, already mentioned above, Prof. Moffatt rejects the opinion of those who find insoluble difficulties in the theory which identifies Gal. ii. 1-10 with Acts xv., and thinks their opinion is based upon meticulous arguments. I am convinced that those difficulties are greater than is generally recognised. To mention only one, which by itself would be decisive, I do not see my way to explain how Paul in Galatians, where every contact he had with Jerusalem is stated with such painful exactitude, could say that he was only *twice* in Jerusalem, if in Galatians ii. 1-10 Acts xv. the *third* visit is described. Nor am I able to explain why Paul (in case Gal. ii. 1-10 refers to the Apostolic Council) does not simply quote the Apostolic Decree and the letter in which it is embodied, instead of writing a long letter to defend his gospel. I am sorry that

even Prof. de Witt Burton in his recent commentary on Galatians has not succeeded in making me believe that these difficulties really are non-existent.

There are two "crucies" which have influenced the whole discussion of the problem, and which must be removed before anything like a common opinion may be expected. The first is an old one: the date of Galatians. That Galatians was written after the Council is for many scholars so axiomatic as to have no need of proof. Prof. Jülicher in a review ¹ asks, "Who will seriously place Galatians before the Apostolic council?" and his opinion in this respect is the opinion of many others. If on the basis of this axiomatic assumption any real agreement had been obtained and any satisfactory explanation of the data in Galatians and Acts had been found, we might acquiesce in it. But this is not the case, not in the least degree. I believe this to be a sufficient reason for trying the other hypothesis, which, though it has not the privilege of the approval of the Tübingen School and its followers, has the support of Beza and Calvin in former centuries, and of Lake, Ramsay ² and Turner in recent days. The present writer has given his own argument in favour of the early date of Galatians in a chapter of his book on the Chronology of the life of St. Paul, and I cannot repeat it here. I am sorry that I cannot simply refer to my book, as I am afraid that Dutch is not so generally read in England as English is read in Holland.

¹ *Wissenschaftliche Forschungsberichte*, herausgegeben von Dr. Karl Hönn, vi. Theologie, Perthes, Gotha, 1921, S. 41.;

² In an additional chapter (dealing with the results given in my book on the Chronology of St. Paul's life) in the 14th edition of his *St. Paul the Traveller*, published in 1920, Sir William Ramsay states his present opinion in these words (p. xxxi.): "As to the date of Epistle of the Galatians we (Sir W. Ramsay and Dr. Plooi) have reached the same conclusion, that it was written before the Apostolic Council (Acts xv.). In this point I have altered my opinion as stated in the present work." (See *The Teaching of St. Paul*, chap. lii.); cf. also his "The Date of the Galatian Letter" in the *EXPOSITOR*, vii. 5 (1913) pp. 127 sqq.

But I may refer to the summary of my book given by Dr. Maurice Jones in this Magazine.¹ At present I only want to lay stress on the advisability of trying the early date of Galatians as a "working hypothesis" in order to see whether in this way a reasonable solution of the problem and its difficulties may be obtained.

The other of the two "cruces" I have in mind is the problem of the so-called "Western" text, especially of the form in which D gives the Apostolic Decree. This problem of course affects the whole textual history of Acts, but it has a special interest with regard to the text of the Apostolic Decree and with regard to the discussions of which this Decree was the result. In this case textual criticism alone is not sufficient; historical and exegetical researches of the most intricate kind are necessary if any reasonable solution is to be reached.

There is not the slightest hope that an agreement ever will be obtained in the great problem of the Apostolic Decree unless a clear insight has been gained into the real character of the conflict and into the principles and practices at stake. In this fundamental problem the very nature of our two sources is a serious obstacle. The conflict bore a markedly acute character; for Paul nothing less than the heart of his Gospel and the freedom in Christ was endangered. And though for Paul himself the Gospel was the only thing that mattered, beside which he did not count himself or anybody else whomsoever worth attention—*ὅποῖός ποτε ἦσαν οὐδέν μοι διαφέρει* (Galatians ii. 6)—as a matter of fact his personal authority in the Churches which he had founded and fostered by his word and prayer was mixed up so completely with the truth of his Gospel that the conflict unavoidably bore a strong personal character. In matters of principle and

¹ The EXPOSITOR for May, June and August, 1919.

truth Paul knew of no bargaining or compromise ; and so at Antioch he, personally and alone, stood for his principles even against Peter and Barnabas : in such cases every deviation from his own Gospel he judged and resisted as a denial of Christ.

This fact, for which the Epistle to the Galatians is proof in every word, compared with the narrative of Luke is for Dr. Jones decisive, and induces him to reject the theory of an early date of Galatians. " This date utterly destroys any faith we may have had in St. Luke's qualities as an accurate historian, and demands that St. Paul was the most successful 'camoufleur' of his day." That is a conclusion I should not be prepared to accept, and, at first not quite understanding Dr. Jones' argument, I had the privilege of a personal interview with him, and feel grateful now for the opportunity of discussing his objection. It really bears upon the very nature of the conflict.

Dr. Jones, in the *EXPOSITOR*, VIII. 6, p. 202 f., puts his objection in this way : " How is St. Paul's attitude at the Council to be explained if the Galatians were in open rebellion and this Epistle had already been written ? The only part," says Dr. Jones, " taken by St. Paul in the deliberations is to quote the undoubted success of his mission among the cities of South Galatia as proof incontrovertible that all the blessings of Christianity were available for the Gentile world, and that without the medium of Judaism. Could St. Paul have honestly used such an argument if he had known, as he must have known according to this theory, that, at that very time and in those very Churches that he had quoted, there had been such a 'set back' as to imperil their Christianity and that these identical Gentiles whom he mentions with such pride as having received Christianity in all the fulness of its blessings without any Judaic conditions, were now drifting with dangerous rapidity in the

contrary direction and were evincing every desire to become Jews as a necessary prelude to their becoming Christians. . . . The situation is impossible."

It seems to me that Dr. Jones here misinterprets the real facts, being deluded in this case by the peculiar character of our two sources of information. He uses one word, however, in which he shows he feels the real situation, which by no means is such an exclusive contrast between Luke and Paul as Dr. Jones represents it further on in his argument. He says that the "set back" in the Galatian Churches did *imperil* their Christianity. It is out of the question indeed that Paul would have said—nor does he say so in his Epistle—that the Galatians in the present state of wavering between his Gospel of faith and the Judaic gospel of law were no more Christians. If so, the epistle would have been written in an entirely different tone. The Galatians did not mean to forsake Christ, any more than even those Judaic Christians who preached to them the Gospel of the circumcision meant to do. Paul says to them (the Galatians) that if *they* (the Gentiles) were to accept circumcision, Christ would be of no use to them. The Galatians did not feel that, did not want that. But they were impressed by the privileges of the Jews and by the authority of the Law. The Law is always easier and more attractive to the mind of the Gentiles, accustomed and inclined to a worship of working their own salvation and of a "do ut des," and to them the advantage of the Jew and the profit of the circumcision seemed to be greater, were at least more palpable than the Gospel of freedom, with all its different attitudes in different circumstances, which Paul preached. In Paul's preaching, as we shall have an opportunity to show more at length, there was not one simple line of conduct. With him almost everything was possible, *πάντα μοι ἔξεστιν*. But to know in which special case there ought to be said, *οὐ συμφέρει*

was by no means very easy. Was not the preaching of the circumcision and the Law much more simple, and had not Israel received the Law with the promises? Nevertheless, even when he saw the Churches of Galatia exposed to the danger that they would forsake his Gospel, the Apostle does not cease to call them his "children" (iv. 19) and his "brethren" (v. 13): and it is with unmistakable emphasis and pregnancy that he says: "Bear ye one another's burdens and so fulfil the law of *Christ*."

On the other hand, would anybody in the Apostolic Council deny that the Galatians and all those Gentile Christians that had embraced the Gospel of Paul were Christians and had become Christians through the blessing of God given to the service of Paul? This could not be denied even by those false brethren that refused to acknowledge Paul's authority. This was the *fact* to which Paul appealed, both according to Luke and in his own letter to the Galatians.¹ And ultimately it was just as in Galatians an appeal to God Himself. Accordingly it is acknowledged without any restrictions both by Peter and James and the whole congregation.

It is true that Paul himself, according to Luke's narrative, does not take any important part in the discussions besides the narrative of what God has done in the realm of missionary work through him and his friends. But was it necessary for Paul to defend himself, when the senior Apostles themselves took his part? Certainly, passionate discussion had preceded, in Antioch already, perhaps in Jerusalem even still. Paul reports about these discussions partly in Galatians ii. 11-21; but there already it is quite clear that Peter did not *motu proprio* endorse the Pharisaic claims. Paul calls him a "hypocrite," meaning thereby that Peter did know better, and had changed his conduct

¹ Acts xiv. 27, xv. 4; Gal. iii. 2.

not from his own conviction but under pressure of others ; and "even" Barnabas was "carried away."

Luke does not say anything about this personal conflict between Paul and Peter at Antioch, because it was only temporarily that Peter was impressed by the arguments of the Judaists, and still further by the unexpected consequences which the Gospel of freedom, preached by Paul and previously accepted by himself, proved to have in a Church where the number of Gentile Christians began to outgrow the Jewish element. That, however, the influence of Paul on the Council (either owing to the private discussions preceding it, or in consequence of the narration of Barnabas and Paul referred to Acts xv. 12, or by both) was greater than at the first sight Luke's narrative seems to indicate, will be shown afterwards, when we proceed to deal with the original text of the Apostolic Decree.

Accordingly I do not see any discrepancy between the Epistle to the Galatians and Luke's statement, that Paul and Barnabas narrated everywhere on their journey to Jerusalem and in Jerusalem itself (Acts xv. 3, 4, 12) what God had done through the service of Paul. Even where this epistle warns the Gentile Christians that to accept circumcision would be losing Christ, it does not in any degree make the impression that Paul had ceased to regard the Galatians as Christians. Yea, even in the Epistle Paul appeals to him who ministereth to them the Spirit and who worketh miracles among them (Gal. iii. 5), and he calls them *ῥεῖοι τοῦ θεοῦ διὰ τῆς πίστεως ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ* (Gal. iii. 26). So, Paul, not only in Jerusalem but unto the Galatians themselves, uses the same argument in favour of his Gospel, and appeals to the same ultimate judgment, viz., the fact that God has given them the Spirit and has worked great things among them through the ministry of Paul. In this as in other points the coincidence between the narrative of Acts

and the spirit in which the Epistle to the Galatians is written, is so strong and so evident as to show that both are closely related not only in regard to their authors, but in regard to the underlying facts of which they are witnesses.

What was the character of the opposition against which Paul had to defend himself in the Epistle? Anton Fridrichsen, in his article mentioned above, thinks that his opponents brought forward the accusation that his Gospel was not in harmony with the preaching of the Apostles in Jerusalem, but that he had borrowed it from an antinomian party in the Jerusalem Church. I think Prof. Mofatt is entirely right when he replies that Fridrichsen's proofs for the existence of such a party in Jerusalem amount to very little indeed: Stephen, Philip the evangelist, Mnason. "But this is not satisfactory evidence." There is no need, indeed, for assuming such an antinomian party as the probable or pretended origin of Paul's preaching of a Gospel of freedom. Jerusalem was the last place where such a party could have struck root. The Jerusalem Church, with its overwhelming majority of Jewish members, could never have been the soil where such a movement could grow: the history and the traditions of the Jerusalem Church are full proof of this thesis. But it must have been the senior Apostles—as representatives of this Jerusalem (i.e. Jewish Christian) Church, with its practice of clinging to circumcision and the Law—who were brought up to oppose a preaching and a practice which only in Gentile Christian circles could spring up and thrive. No theories, but facts, led to the conflict. And it was by the Providence of God that a man who had been brought up as a Pharisee should preach the Gospel of freedom, because he had experienced that not the Law, but Christ and Christ alone, could save him, and had saved him.

The spreading of the Gospel amongst the Gentiles must

inevitably lead to the question whether Jewish law and Jewish *custom* had to be obeyed by Gentile-Christians, and if so, how far. This question did not arise with the preaching of Paul, but with the first Gentile who was converted. And accordingly not Paul, but the first Christian who came across a Gentile who confessed belief in Christ, had to decide whether this Gentile first ought to become a Jew. I never have been able to understand the objection made to the story of Cornelius in Acts x. in this respect. If we deny that Peter could have decided as he is reported to have done in Acts x. 46-48, the influence of the teaching of Jesus is reduced practically to nil, and the Christian Peter did not differ from any ordinary Jew. That there were difficulties to be overcome, especially difficulties of old custom and tradition, is fully indicated by the narrative of Acts x. itself. But that they were overcome in this case, lay in the very nature of the Gospel as preached by Jesus and embraced by the early circle of His followers.

This does not imply that there was not a *de facto* difference between Paul and the senior Apostles, which we shall have to discuss presently. But now we only lay stress upon the fact that the whole tendency of Paul's defence is to show, not that he is independent of any party in Jerusalem, but independent of any human influence whatsoever with regard to the full meaning and sway of his preaching. No authority, however great even in Jerusalem, did he acknowledge beyond the authority of Him who "separated him from his mother's womb and called Him by His Grace to reveal His Son in him, that he might preach Him among the Heathen."

In Judæa the possibility that a Gentile could become a Christian without becoming a Jew was acknowledged before Paul. But the difficulty was, how far this principle could be fully accepted in all its consequences. It was

taken for granted, by Paul as much as by the senior Apostles and every Jewish Christian, that a Jewish Christian was bound to fulfil the Law, even if they acknowledged as they all did, that there was no salvation through the Law. The objection against Paul mentioned in Acts xxi. is not that he preaches freedom from the Law for Gentiles, but that he is said to preach this freedom also for the Jews, a thing which Paul never did, and which he wished openly to deny by the publicity of a legal ceremony.

But nevertheless, there were difficulties of practice, and these difficulties became manifest and acute as soon as a Jewish majority in a Christian Church began to be a minority. Of these difficulties not only Galatians and Acts xv., but for instance the epistles to the Romans and to the Corinthians, are witness as well. The most characteristic and outstanding feature of the Law was its tendency to separate the nation of Israel from the nations of the world, to make them avoid every pollution with the Gentiles who did not keep the ritual Law. Here is the conflict : How far does Christian freedom go ? The Pharisee says : as far as Law goes. Paul says : as far as Love goes. The senior Apostles had to decide, and that the decision was not easy is evidenced by the case of Peter at Antioch. One point is the problem of the *εἰδωλόθοντα* discussed in 1 Cor. viii. and in Romans xiv. Another is the Sabbath day, also in Romans xiv. And the Apostolic Decree shows that there were at least two points more : *πορνεία* and *αἷμα*. Paul gives his standard of Christian life in Romans xiv. 13 : *τοῦτο κρῖναι τὸ μὴ τιθέναι πρόσκομμα τῷ ἀδελφῷ ἢ σκάνδαλον*. And in Galatians v. 13 : *διὰ τῆς ἀγάπης δουλεύετε ἀλλήλοις*.

So the problem was not a problem of one day nor of one place ; wherever throughout the Roman Empire the Gentile element in the Christian Churches outgrew the original Jewish community there the conflict was bound inevitably

to come. And now this is the wonderful solution given by this man of highest Christian ideals: "I am free, not only to live as if no Jewish prejudices or Gentile demons existed, and thus to eat any meat I please from the market; but I am free also *not* to do so, and to take the part of my weaker brethren, if by my 'freedom' I should become a stumbling-block to them."

But what are we to make of such a man? A man that feels at liberty to preach everything according to the circumstances? One who may preach circumcision—for Jews it is true, but circumcision still (Gal. v. 11)—and who at the same time says that if the Gentiles accept circumcision, Christ has died for them in vain? A man who could eat meat sacrificed to the idols, if nobody takes offence at it, but who would eat vegetables if any weak brother would object to his eating meat? Is not that *ἀνθρώποις ἀρέσκειν* (Gal. i. 10)? We feel the difficulty, especially for such Jewish Christians as never came across a Christian community in surroundings nearly entirely Gentile. And more still for such Jewish Christians as were accustomed to a merely legal standard of daily life; and for whom the freedom of Paul's Gospel was synonymous with libertinism or even libidinism (Gal. v. 13, *ἐλευθερία εἰς ἀφορμὴν τῇ σαρκί*). Hence the opposition from the Pharisaic false brethren, hence also the impression which this opposition made in Galatia.

The Judaistic opposition in Galatia and in Antioch was right in so far as the Jerusalem practice was concerned and the actual attitude of the senior Apostles in Christian Churches mainly Jewish in origin. The question which alarmed the Gentile Churches did not exist there, and the relatively small number of Gentiles joining these Churches lived like Jews or like ordinary proselytes. Everybody who realises the significance and influence of what has been called "le milieu" will understand this.

On one occasion however, says Paul, the problem of Gentile Churches and of the freedom preached there by him was discussed in Jerusalem. It was after the great success of the Gospel in Antioch, where Paul had preached and worked with Barnabas a full year and where the growth of the Church was so conspicuous, even to the Gentile population of that city, that the Christian congregation was recognised as different from the Jewish Synagogue, and where accordingly the followers of Jesus were stigmatised as "Christians." This would *not* have been the case if in practice and custom the Christians simply had followed the Jewish tradition. It took scores of years before the Roman government and the Classic historians were aware that the Christian Church was something else than a mere sectarian Jewish group. If in Antioch so early the difference was remarkable enough to call forth a special nickname, we must assume that there was something conspicuous and obtrusive which distinguished the Christians from the Jews. This distinctive peculiarity must have been the Pauline practice of freedom from the Law. Paul was perfectly aware that on this point his preaching and his practice in the Gentile world differed from the practice in Jerusalem; and if he were not aware of this, the "false brethren" would have taught him. The "false brethren" did not come from the Antiochian circles themselves, for there the Pauline practice was accepted and followed without any difficulty. The attacks came from without.

But at all events, when going to Jerusalem, Paul availed himself of the opportunity to consult the senior Apostles, who wholly agreed with him and gave him the right hand of fellowship.

There remained, however, a difficulty which the senior Apostles did not realise at the moment. They felt the advisability of avoiding conflicts and offence; and so they

agreed with one another that the realm of work should be divided into two parts. Paul should go to the Gentiles, Peter to the Circumcision. This decision was possible only at a time when the outlook was as yet very limited, and can hardly have been fixed after the missionary journey in Galatia, which had shown the immeasurable possibilities of the Gospel in the Gentile world. At all events the decision *evaded* the difficulty but did not definitely *solve* it.

The conflict broke out as soon as Jerusalem Christians, accustomed to the practice in a Jewish community and clinging to the Law and its commandments, came to Antioch and to the Galatian Churches. There they found a quite different manner of life ; food laws and ritual laws were practically disobeyed, not only by Gentile Christians, but by Jewish Christians as well, in so far as these had free intercourse and communion with "unclean" Gentiles. The obligation to be circumcised was never laid upon the Gentiles, not even in Jerusalem (Gal. ii. 3, 5), but that the "freedom which the Gentile Christians had in Christ Jesus" was quite a new experience for Jewish Christians who had lived hitherto only in a Jewish centre, is clearly shown by the fact that Peter, coming to Antioch, at first conformed to the Antiochian practice, but after the arrival of "some from James," shrank from the consequences, and that even Barnabas was impressed by their arguments. And it was only natural that, with a view to those consequences of the free Gospel, the other alternative was brought forward and obligatory circumcision became the war cry.

This alternative was not accepted either by Paul or by Peter or Barnabas. As a matter of fact it was contrary to the Jerusalem practice itself, and there is not a trace of evidence to justify the Tübingen antithesis in this respect, the problem *not* being a problem of theories, but of practice and of custom. The indignation with which Paul withstood

Peter to the face was due to the fact that here in Antioch Peter did not draw the consequence of the Jerusalem agreement and practice. For not only the senior Apostles on a former occasion had fully acknowledged the right of the Gentiles and the truth of Paul's Gospel, but the practice in Jerusalem itself must inevitably lead to the practice as established in Antioch. If in Jerusalem the Gentile Christians were admitted to communion without being circumcised, the Law was no more obligatory for them, and accordingly Paul stigmatises Peter's conduct as "hypocrisy," i.e., Peter knows better.

The controversy was not quite clear, even on the side of Paul. There was a real difficulty, which by an absolute alternative could not be removed. Paul stands for his Gentile Churches and for their freedom in Christ ; ultimately he stands for the all-sufficiency of Christ for salvation. But the Jewish Christians had their right too. If they were bound by the Law, how could they keep up communion with the Gentiles that did not keep the Law, even though these Gentiles were Christians ? Did not the Law itself forbid such communion ?

The Pharisaic party draws the easiest consequence, chooses the simple alternative : circumcision and the whole Law obligatory for all. But what will the Church in Jerusalem, what will the senior Apostles decide ? *In the Epistle to the Galatians Paul is not certain what they will do.* This is for me one of the strongest arguments and clearest indications that the Epistle has been written before the Council. In Galatians Paul only states with regard to the senior Apostles that on their former interview relating to his preaching there had been no question of making the circumcision obligatory for the Gentiles ; no compulsion had been brought to bear on the Greek Titus to be circumcised ; the Gospel of Paul amongst the Gentiles was fully

acknowledged ; and the division of the missionary field had been settled : the Gentile part was to be evangelised by Paul, the Jewish part by Peter. And no restriction or obligation was laid upon Paul but to remember the poor brethren in Jerusalem.

But this was only a private and provisional regulation ; the real question of practice was not solved but postponed. And it could not be evaded when in Antioch the question became acute. That this occurred in Antioch was only natural. Antioch was at once a city mainly Gentile and yet in constant contact with Jerusalem. The question was : What will Jerusalem do, and how will the senior Apostles decide ? *Paul does not know, he does not care, at least he refuses to make his own position and conviction dependent on any decision of the senior Apostles.* He knows that for the bulk of Christians, in Jewish and in Gentile circles, the Jesus-Apostles and James the brother of the Lord, and the Mother Church in Jerusalem, have decisive authority. He sees the possibility that this authority might be used by them, as it has been already abused by the " false brethren," to lead astray his own Churches. In the eyes of many, he knows, they are οἱ δοκοῦντες εἶναί τι. But as far as he personally is concerned, he is dependent upon God alone, and ὁποῖοι ποτε ἦσαν οὐδέν μοι διαφέρει, πρόσωπον ὁ θεὸς ἀνθρώπου οὐ λαμβάνει, and both in his Epistle and in the conflict with Peter he stands by himself in defending his Gospel, even if the senior Apostles should eventually reject it. This means first that Paul is *not* sure which side the senior Apostles will take ; that there is a possibility that they might take the wrong side as Peter did in Antioch. It means also that Paul in these decisive days saved Christianity from being a mere Jewish sect. Without his unshaken faith in his own calling, without his invincible courage in defending his freedom in Christ, possibly the Christian Church would have been led

by the senior Apostles into the ways of narrow sectarianism.

Both in Antioch and in Jerusalem the *facts* decided the matter. "If thou, Peter, being a Jew, livest after the manner of the Gentiles, and not as do the Jews, why compellest thou the Gentiles to live as do the Jews?" It was an appeal to Peter's conduct in Jerusalem, where he and every Jewish Christian did not shun intercourse with the uncircumcised Gentile Christians. It was largely an "argumentum ad hominem," still it was quite "ad rem" too. And as Peter is the first to speak in Jerusalem in favour of the Gospel of freedom, we may be sure that he without much difficulty had recognised the truth of Paul's objections. In Jerusalem Paul equally appeals to the *facts*: God's blessing of Paul's ministry is manifest and is proof sufficient that Paul and his Gospel have a right to full acknowledgment. There is no trace whatever that the demand of the Pharisaic brethren, that circumcision should be obligatory equally to Gentiles and Jews, was supported by any of the leading men in Jerusalem. This would have been an innovation indeed and a reaction. Still there must have been some hesitation in James with a view to the consequences; he is slow to speak, and when he speaks he acknowledges the fact that God has taken "a people for his name from the Gentiles," but he is eager to show how this fact agrees with the prophecies of the Old Testament, and at once proposes a kind of "modus vivendi" to take away the offence which unlimited freedom to the Gentiles might give the innumerable Jews scattered all over the world.¹

At all events, James too gives way, with one restriction however, a restriction which must have had the full

¹ It seems to me that this must be the meaning of the last sentence of James' address. I cannot discuss here the manifold other explanations given of this closing sentence, but it seems to me that James wants to guarantee the Jewish populations throughout the world from being offended by too unscrupulous freedom on the side of the Gentile Christians.

approval of Paul himself : that the Gentile Christians might take account of the feelings of their Jewish Christian brethren, who could not help being sensitive with regard to those ritual and moral customs which they were taught to keep from their youth. It was the problem of the food-law that had given rise to the conflict. In principle the matter had been settled, the Gentile Christians were merely requested to avoid giving offence.

That is, if I am right, the meaning of the Apostolic Decree. It is not a compromise in the ordinary sense of the term ; no principle was at stake any more than the principle of Christian Love teaching us to bear each other's burdens and to fulfil in this way a Law higher than the Jewish Law, viz., the Law of Christ (Gal. vi. 2). That does not lessen the extraordinary importance of the decision : customs are often stronger than theories, and for a Jew ritual uncleanness had become an object of almost natural abhorrence. If the Jews passed that over, they showed how great the influence of Christian Love and of Jesus' example was upon their hearts. The Gentiles could and should show they appreciated that by avoiding everything which might give needless offence. How far Paul's personal influence may be traced in this decision, we may try to show from a comparison of the Epistle to the Galatians and Acts xv. in still another direction. As this subject, however, lies to a great extent on the textual side of the problem, we are obliged to reserve this for a second article.

D. PLOOIJ.

LIBERAL PROTESTANTISM AND MODERNIST CRITICISM.

IT is a significant fact that the book which ultimately called forth the condemnation of Modernism in the Roman Church was a defence of Catholicism and a polemic against Liberal Protestantism. Loisy's *L'Évangile et l'Église* was certainly a most searching criticism of Harnack's *Das Wesen des Christentums*, and even the orthodox could appreciate the spectacle of the Catholic scholar using the critical weapons of the Protestant against the Protestant position. Yet the Roman Church with a more than Trojan caution declined the gift of the new apologetic, being suspicious of its source. Loisy's book was held to be tainted with Protestantism and rationalism, in spite of the fact that it traversed the positions of Harnack in an extraordinarily acute and penetrating manner.

Outside the Catholic ranks, it has been too readily assumed that Modernism was a variant of Protestantism, and Loisy's originality as a critic has been somewhat underrated. For it would not be extravagant to say that *L'Évangile et l'Église* represents new tendencies in criticism, and it is within the truth to say that it represents a new appreciation of principles which were being but slackly applied in the older Liberal Protestant schools. The most distinguished Modernist scholars stand for two principles of criticism, both of which imperil the Protestant position. These two principles will be found in the two main lines of attack which Loisy develops against Harnack. His first main line of attack consists in this, that Harnack clothes primitive Christianity in too modern a dress. The Liberal Protestants, it is claimed, interpret the leading ideas of the Gospels in accordance with their own desires and preconceptions.

But this is a fault in critical method. The first duty of the modernist, as critic, is not to modernise. "The Gospel has come into existence independently of ourselves: let us try to understand it in itself, before we interpret it in relation to our preferences or our needs." (*L'Évangile et L'Église*, p. xiv.). "The historian must resist the temptation to modernise the idea of the kingdom" (p. 56). We are always tempted, in reading the Gospels, to assume that what is important to us must have been important to Jesus and the first disciples. The historian has to overcome this natural bias, and the charge against the Liberal Protestant is that he has succumbed to it. The second line of attack which Loisy develops is even more destructive to Protestantism, if it can be sustained. He denies the validity of Harnack's enterprise, denies the possibility of detaching the essence of Christianity from the whole primitive Christian fact, at least in the way in which Harnack attempts to do it. Loisy challenges the Protestant appeal to primitive Christianity as a standard by which the subsequent development is to be judged. The essence of Christianity is not some static formula to be discovered in its beginnings. Its essence can only be understood by tracing the course of its development. Christianity is essentially process, growth. To seek to return to primitive Christianity, is to put the grown man back into baby clothes.

These principles are not invented simply to form a Catholic apologetic. They are accepted as fundamental in what may be called the modernist school of criticism, whether the critics be Catholic or not. The British scholar who most closely resembles Loisy, and who may deservedly be compared with Loisy for brilliance and independence, is Professor Kirsopp Lake. His quarrel with the Modern Churchmen is not unlike Loisy's conflict with Harnack,

and his work is governed by essentially the same principles. Though he is not engaged in directly attacking Protestantism, liberal or popular, and much less in defending Catholicism, yet his results do tend to disparage the Reformation, and to undermine the Protestant appeal to the New Testament as to a classic standard of Christianity. Loisy's two main principles, without their conscious anti-Protestant application, may be found in the opening paragraphs of Lake's *Landmarks of Early Christianity*. The menace to Protestantism however is obvious, though it is not stressed, or necessarily intended. "At first sight," writes Professor Lake, "the historian of religions appears to be faced by a number of clearly distinguished entities, to each of which he feels justified in giving the name of a separate religion; but on further consideration it becomes obvious that each one of these entities has been in a condition of flux throughout its history. Each began as a combination or synthesis of older forms of thought with comparatively little new in its composition; each ended by disintegrating into many elements of which the worst disappeared, while the best were taken up into new life in some new religion. The movement was more marked at some times than at others, and the differentiation of the various religions depends chiefly on the recognition of these moments of more rapid change. But the process never really stopped; from beginning to end new elements were constantly absorbed and old elements dropped. For religion lives through the death of religions.

"Nothing illustrates this so well as the history of Christianity, for no religion is so well known. The facts are plainly visible and would be plainly seen by all, were it not for the general tendency of ecclesiastical scholarship to consult the records of the past only to find the reflection of its own features."

Here then we have the two main characteristics of Modernist criticism, its resolve to have done with the perpetual tendency to fashion the past according to our hearts' desires, and its belief in the supremacy of the Heraclitian principle *πάντα χωρεῖ* in the history of religion. The first characteristic leads the Modernist critic to distrust and disparage those suggestions of affinity between the New Testament and our own experience on which Protestantism builds. The second denies to primitive Christianity any such clearness and steadiness of outline, and any such finality as would render hopeful the appeal to it as a standard. The New Testament itself is not a classic standard, but a succession of imperfect syntheses, the first items in a progressive series unintelligible almost without the sequel.

Apart altogether from their reaction on Protestantism, these elements in modernist criticism deserve closer examination. The first is an indisputable principle of historic study, and so far as it applies to the study of Christian origins, cannot be better formulated than in the words of Loisy already quoted: "The Gospel has come into existence independently of us: let us try to understand it in itself, before we interpret it in relation to our preferences or our needs." This principle is so important and temptations to forget it are so constant, that sharp reaffirmations of it by new schools of critics are a necessity for progress in historical enquiry. It would be difficult to over-estimate the services of Loisy, Schweitzer, Lake and others who might be called Modernist in giving a fresh edge to the critical conscience on this issue. Nor is it surprising that Liberal Protestant scholarship has so largely been subjected to attack. The tardy recognition both of the eschatological and the sacramental features of New Testament Christianity indicated the extent to which Liberal Protestant scholarship had yielded to bias. The Modernist critics had good

reason to constitute themselves the champions of a sound critical principle. Yet their position is not without its dangers. Probably every valid canon of criticism is liable to be distorted by an exaggerated rigour, or is shadowed by some fallacy. If the Protestant is tempted to assimilate the past to the present, the Modernist is apt to depreciate or deny any parallel between past and present. The caricature of the critical principle for which Lake and Loisy stand will appear in a tendency to exaggerate the remoteness and strangeness of the past. That this bias exists in the work of Professor Lake, that it is increasing and that it ought to be diminished, may be demonstrated by one or two examples.

We may take first the discussion of inspiration in *Landmarks of Early Christianity*. Professor Lake explains the primitive Christian account of prophecy as due to possession by the Spirit of God, and suggests that this view of inspiration had its natural association with the belief in demon-possession which we reject. He goes on to argue that we can no longer hold the early Christian doctrine of the Spirit. He states the point thus :

“Does the experience of controlling force which the prophet feels really come from some external influence, or is it merely his consciousness of ordinarily unknown depths in his own nature ? It is obvious that a theory of prophecy could be made on lines rendered familiar by psychologists, by suggesting that what happens in a prophetic experience is the sudden “coming up” of what is ordinarily “subliminal.” It is, however, important to remember that this is merely a modern hypothesis, just as the Jewish view of inspiration was an ancient one. But it is impossible in a rational theology to combine fragments of two wholly different explanations of life and of the universe. ‘The Spirit’ was an admirably intelligible phrase in the Jewish or early Christian view of the universe ; it does not fit in well with the modern view of the universe. Similarly the theory of subliminal action fits very well into the modern view, but not into that of traditional Christian theology. Preachers seem to make a serious mistake when they try to combine

the language of two rival hypotheses to explain the same human experience."

Two features of Professor Lake's treatment of this theme reveal the bias that may easily vitiate Modernist criticism. The first is, the close association of inspiration with possession, the insistence on the parallel between inspiration by the Holy Spirit and possession by evil spirits. The second is the assertion that there is no common ground between the early Christian doctrine of the Spirit and any modern psychological account of inspiration. The parallel contains a dangerous exaggeration; the assertion is demonstrably false. It is not indeed necessary to dispute the parallel between belief in the Holy Spirit and belief in demons, nor the historical connexion in origin of the conceptions. The idea of external spiritual influence is involved both in prophecy and in demon-possession, as Professor Lake asserts. There were ecstatic gifts of the Spirit among the primitive Christians which resembled very closely the phenomena of demon-possession. But there the parallel ends. That the early Christians were conscious of a vast difference between prophetic inspiration and demon-possession, *psychologically as well as morally*, ought to be clear to any critic. In prophecy as St. Paul understood and experienced it there is no such supersession of the personality as is characteristic of demon-possession. But the Modernist critic is so impressed by the parallel that he is surprised by elements of difference even when he notes them. Thus, In the *Beginnings of Christianity* (Vol. i. p. 257) the editors note: "Men were not left without help in an unequal combat with these malignant spirits. *Just as they could be possessed by unclean spirits, so also they could be inspired by the Holy Spirit of God* and in the end good would triumph over evil. It would be *natural* to expect that just as the evil spirits were regarded as personal

and as many, so there would be many holy spirits, but in point of fact there is little trace of this development. The Holy Spirit which inspires prophets is almost always one." If the writers had not exaggerated in their own minds the parallel between possession and inspiration, they would not have entertained this natural expectation. There is an essential difference in experience to which they fail to do justice, because they desire to associate primitive Christian views of inspiration as closely as possible with a belief in possession that is repugnant to the modern mind.

However parallel in origin and character to the belief in demon-possession the early Christian doctrine of the Spirit may be, is it really incompatible with modern psychology? Professor Lake contrasts the subliminal consciousness with an external spiritual influence and asserts that we may interpret prophecy in terms of the one or the other, but we may not combine the two. We may respectfully ask, why not? There is no real incompatibility in the statements "the prophet spoke as moved by the Spirit of God" and "the prophet spoke through the sudden emergence into consciousness of something hitherto subliminal." Certainly the second statement cannot exclude the first, and the same person may whole-heartedly make both affirmations, if he wishes. To say that the prophet becomes conscious of ordinarily unknown depths in his own nature does not compel us to deny that he is controlled by some external influence. The alternative put by Professor Lake would be a real alternative if our own natures below consciousness are inaccessible to influence from other external sources. So far from having proved this, modern psychology has practically disproved it. This idea that our subconscious minds cannot be the theatre of the operations of any spiritual influence external to ourselves is not bound up with any view of the universe that modern thought has

substantiated. Moreover Professor Lake does not hold it. He believes that "a helping hand of grace stretches out from the unknown to help man when he cries from the depths" (p. 83), and he also develops a view of personalities as a series of islands which are really linked together in the foundations of their being—a view which, if taken seriously, means that in the ordinarily unknown depths of our nature we are more open to influences from a larger life than we are in our more superficial consciousness. There is no reason why a modern psychologist should not believe as definitely in control by the Holy Spirit as St. Paul did, nor yet why he should not express his doctrine of the Spirit in practically the same terms as those used by the Apostle. This alleged incompatibility between an early Christian doctrine of the Spirit and a theory of subliminal action is a mere Modernist bogey. Any Modernist who remains a theist can affirm the primitive Christian doctrine in the primitive Christian language without any disloyalty to modern psychology and without any conflict with the modern view of the universe, whatever it may be. That this Modernist bias is growing in the case of Professor Lake seems to be proved by comparing *Landmarks of Early Christianity* with his previous book, *The Stewardship of Faith*. Then he did not despair of combining the outlook of psychology with the standpoint of traditional theology, as witness the following footnote.

"It is worth noticing that the modern psychiatrists would say that the sacraments 'work' by suggestion; the theologians say by 'faith.' In the end they are not so far apart, and ultimately they will probably learn to understand and value each other's contribution" (p. 117n.).

This hope of combining old and new is surely more capable of justification than the assertion of their utter incompatibility. The Modernist tendency to exaggerate the gulf

between past and present is manifestly impairing Professor Lake's judgment as a critic.

A further illustration of the same characteristics may be found in Professor Lake's handling of the subject of salvation. In *The Stewardship of Faith* (p. 86 ff.), he works out the contrast between the intellectual attitudes of the Greek and the Jew. He describes the Greek as seeking a new nature through sacramental regeneration, while the Jew is concerned with security from the impending wrath of God and wants to know what he must do to be saved. It is suggested that Greek and Jew stand, not so much for national as for psychological differences, and the difference is practically equivalent to William James's contrast between the twice-born and the once-born. But when we turn to *The Landmarks of Early Christianity*, we find that the Jewish and Greek conceptions of salvation have been thinned down until they leave no possibility of parallel with any modern psychology. The Greek idea of salvation is sacramental and magical, the Jewish is eschatological and mythological. Neither has part or lot in modern thinking.

"We can, with logical propriety, accept the Græco-Jewish eschatology or the Græco-Oriental sacramental regeneration if we reject modern thought. But we cannot, except in intellectual chaos, combine the two, or appropriately express modern thought in language belonging to the ancient systems.

"The modern man does not believe in any form of salvation known to ancient Christianity."

If we concede to Professor Lake that the magical and mythological elements are absolutely alien to our world of thought, and that we may not even find natural the parallels to modern religious psychology which Professor Lake himself discerned in his earlier book, yet surely the concluding sentence: "The modern man does not believe in any form of salvation known to ancient Christianity" is an exaggeration. If Professor Lake's analysis of early Christian con-

ceptions of salvation were exhaustive, we might agree with him, but he has, as a matter of fact, simply emphasised those elements in early Christianity which are most alien to our ways of thinking, and ignored all those elements which we have in common with the first Christians. In particular, he passes over the all-important present moral element in salvation, as described in the New Testament, and indeed in other early Christian writings, and there are plenty of men and women to-day who, in the light of their own experience, have no difficulty at all in understanding what St. Paul meant by "being delivered from the body of this death," or by "becoming a new creation in Christ Jesus." The moral salvation that was offered to Jew and Greek in the first century does not differ from the moral salvation that the modern man enters into. The limitations of Professor Lake's handling of this subject again betray the Modernist bias.

Perhaps one more illustration may be permitted. In connexion with the Prologue to St. John's Gospel Professor Lake adduces a passage from Cornutus which he thinks may throw light on the Logos doctrine of the Evangelist. He insists that the difficulty of gauging the significance of the Prologue is due to the fact that the word "Logos" is used in different ways in different systems of thought. He contrasts the Stoic idea of the Logos as immanent with the Platonic idea of the Logos as a connecting link between a transcendent God and the world; and then we come to a third use of the term Logos:

"Finally, a mediatising writer such as Cornutus could explain that the Logos was Hermes, and so triumphantly reconcile philosophy and myth by giving a mythological meaning to a philosophic term."

Then, after suggesting that the writer of the Fourth Gospel seems to view the Logos in the Platonic rather than the Stoic way, he adds:

"But how far is the Prologue really metaphysical, and not comparable in its identification of Jesus and the Logos to Cornutus with his identification of Hermes and the Logos?"

Now it may be pointed out, in the first place, that the identification of Hermes with the Logos is not an alternative view to the Stoic and Platonic views previously summarised. If the term Logos is being used philosophically by Cornutus he may very well be using it either in the Stoic or the Platonic sense. The so-called "mediatising" view is not different from the Stoic or Platonic views. It may include either or combine both. As a matter of fact, Cornutus is generally recognised as a Stoic, and his interpretations of other Greek gods, of Zeus for example, are certainly Stoic in tendency. If then he identifies Hermes with the Logos, we may assume that he uses the term in the Stoic sense. Again, it is absurd to describe his chapter on Hermes as giving a mythological meaning to a philosophic term. What he is really doing is giving a philosophic meaning to a mythological figure. He does not say to his pupil: "You can understand this difficult philosophic word 'Logos' by recognising that the Logos is Hermes, but: "You can understand those curious stories of Hermes if you recognise that Hermes is nothing but the Logos."¹

To return, then, to the suggested parallel between the Prologue of St. John's Gospel and the writings of Cornutus, we may note, first, that if the parallel exists, the Prologue may none the less be really metaphysical, and the enquiry

¹ As a matter of fact, Cornutus is not here giving a Logos doctrine in the full meaning of the term. In the passage which Professor Lake cites, "Logos" is simply "Reason," the Reason that distinguishes men from animals. It is not the soul of the world, or even the link between a transcendent God and the world. When Cornutus does refer to the Logos in the sense in which it is manifestly used in the Prologue to the Fourth Gospel, he identifies the Logos, not with Hermes, but with Heracles. *Ἡρακλῆς δ' ἐστὶν ὁ ἐν τοῖς ὅλοις λόγος καθ' ὃν ἡ φύσις ἰσχυρὰ καὶ κραταῖα ἐστίν.* (c. 31.)

as to its affinities with Stoic or Platonic or other doctrines of the Logos is not rendered superfluous. And, secondly, we may note that if the parallel exists, it will be found in one or both of two points. The Evangelist may hold the same view of the Logos as Cornutus holds, and he may regard Jesus in the same way as Cornutus regards Hermes. On the former point the parallel is only significant as a footnote to Dr. Harris's *Stoic Origins of the Prologue*. On the latter point the parallel clearly breaks down. To Cornutus, Hermes is simply a mythological figure, and to the writer of the Fourth Gospel, Jesus is certainly a historic person. Of the many parallels that have been adduced from time to time to illustrate the doctrine of the Logos in the Fourth Gospel, it would be difficult to find one less relevant than this sentence from Cornutus, and it would seem to follow that here too we have the tendency of the Modernist critic to assume that the more strange and bizarre an interpretation of early Christian thought is, the more likely it is to correspond with historical fact.

It is not possible in this way to cut all the links between primitive Christianity and the modern mind. The mind of Jesus and of His first apostles is not really so inaccessible to the ordinary reader to-day as Professor Lake would have us believe when he writes :

"No historical reconstruction can make the thoughts and words of Jesus adequate for our generation, or even intelligible except to those who have passed through an education in history impossible for most."

The Modernist criticism has indeed refuted the claim of popular Protestantism to be the simple reproduction of primitive Christianity. It is clear that even apostolic Christianity is not, strictly speaking, either Protestant or Catholic. Both the Catholic and the Protestant positions may fairly be described as dependent on differing value judgments within the covers of the New Testament.

Critical study also justifies the Modernist in claiming that primitive Christianity cannot be reproduced. We cannot simply return to the thought-world even of the New Testament. But it is a *tour de force* to deny the reality of the link between Protestantism and St. Paul, let us say. And it is a still greater *tour de force* to deny that the spirit of Jesus can be conveyed by His words across the centuries to the men of the present generation. Liberal Protestantism may have erred by trying to make Jesus a denizen of the nineteenth century, but it is a greater error on the part of the Modernists to try to confine Jesus within the limits of the first century.

If, then, the Protestant appeal to the New Testament cannot be ruled out on the ground that there is an impassable gulf fixed between the first century and the present day, is the Protestant contention really overthrown by the other cardinal principle of Modernism—that Christianity is not a single religion but a complex of many, and that it must be regarded as a process and not a result? The appeal to this principle against the reformers would only be valid if we exclude the Reformation itself from the process, which is Christianity. If we exclude the Reformation from the process of development, as both Loisy and Lake appear to do, then indeed this modernist theory of development furnishes a Catholic apologetic, but it does this only by begging the question at issue. A scientific historian of religions is not permitted to start with this arbitrary judgment as to what does or does not belong to the true development of Christianity. The tests of true development which Professor Lake seems to accept are, first, historic continuity; and secondly, that the process is synthetic. In the *Beginnings of Christianity* (vol. i. p. 265) we have this sentence: "To the historian of religions, Christianity appears, not a single religion, but a complex of many,

justified in claiming the name of Christianity by reason of the thread of historic continuity which runs through and connects its component parts"; and in *The Landmarks of Early Christianity* we have the assertion that "Christianity begins like other religions as a synthesis of older forms of thought, with comparatively little new," and that "the history of Christianity might be written as a series of syntheses with the thought and practice of the Roman world." "As to the Reformation, it is impossible for the student of history to feel that it can be regarded as a synthesis. Indeed it seems ominously like the first step in that disintegration which has always been the last stage in the story of each religion." It follows that the process, which is Christianity, is a succession of syntheses without violent interruption, and that the Reformation marks the setting in of another process, the process of disintegration rather than development.

When we remember the extraordinary transformations which institutions have undergone, we may question whether mere historic continuity would justify the application of the term Christianity to each successive synthesis, and there is some danger of the name of Christianity becoming meaningless in the hands of the Modernist critic, if he is satisfied to give it to any development which is attached to primitive Christianity simply by the thread of historic continuity. But the real issue turns on the nature and character of the series of syntheses which do actually play such an important part in Church History. Professor Lake assumes that synthesis is progress. "Each religion began as a combination of synthesis of older forms of thought with comparatively little new in its composition; each ended by disintegrating into many elements of which the worst disappeared while the best were taken up into new life in some new religion." Both these propositions are doubtful,

but we may pass over the first and concentrate on the second. Is it the case that in each successive synthesis which constitutes a new religion or through which any given religion passes, the worst elements disappear and the best are taken up into new life? Primitive Christianity, on this view, begins by taking up all that was best in Judaism, and leaving behind all that was worst. In the light of Church History, can we legitimately say that? In the successive syntheses with Roman thought and practice, can we assume that there came over from the disintegrating paganism only good elements, and that bad elements were excluded? There is no reason *a priori* to expect that, and the study of the facts of Church History does not justify this optimism. Is this picture of a series of syntheses that always carries on the best and discards the worst really true in the history of any religion? Did Buddhism carry on only what was good in Brahminism, and exclude all that was evil? Did Mahomet take over from the Judaism and Christianity of his day all that was good, and leave behind all that was evil? Or did primitive Quakerism take over from Puritanism all that was good and nothing that was evil? This optimistic view of the synthetic process which *is* Church History has neither philosophic nor empirical justification. We cannot exclude the possibility that in primitive Christianity there were elements, essential elements, the best elements, which were not fully assimilated in the syntheses with the thought of the Roman world. And if that possibility exists, there will always be room for a movement which goes back to the New Testament and asks whether, in our successive syntheses, we have not overlooked something of importance. The re-discovery of some element of primitive Christianity which has been ignored or worn down in the process with which the Modernist identifies Christianity may no doubt be disintegrating,

but it may be essential for the development and the understanding of Christianity itself.

It is certain that the Protestant position cannot fairly be dismissed by this Modernist emphasis on flux and movement in Christian thought, and ultimately it is not a critical principle, but a negative attitude towards the Reformation itself which gives the suggestion of anti-Protestant bias to the writings of Professor Lake. It is remarkable that, in speaking of the syntheses that constitute the history of Christianity, he fastens on the great figures of Origen and St. Thomas Aquinas, and even associates an important ethical synthesis with the name of Ambrose, but there is no mention of St. Augustine, whose work as a theologian is at least as synthetic and as significant as that of Origen, or St. Thomas Aquinas. But the Augustinian synthesis was based on an element in Christianity that is very important for the understanding of the Reformation and for the interpretation of New Testament Christianity, but which did not happen to appeal very much to Origen, and which does not appeal very much apparently to Professor Lake. But clearly the historian of religions, and of the Christian religion in particular, cannot afford to ignore this element, or to treat it simply as a disintegrating factor. The Liberal Protestant position has not really been disposed of by Modernist criticism, and the anti-Protestant bias, which undoubtedly exists among Modernist critics, is likely adversely to affect the value of their criticism itself.

H. G. WOOD.

FRESH LIGHT ON THE BOOK OF ESTHER.

PERHAPS no Old Testament book has caused more discussion and controversy than this one. And, among Christian scholars at least, the view generally held of late years has

allowed only a very slender, if any, historical foundation for the story. It has been left to a Jewish savant, Dr. Jacob Hoschander,¹ to make a brilliant and, as the writer thinks, a successful attempt to establish the book as a definitely historical tradition giving a real account of actual events and persons. This is of extreme interest. For it is now agreed that already by the year 400 there were very many Jewish colonies outside Palestine—not only in Persia and Babylonia but in Egypt and also Asia Minor and Greece. In the time of Ezra the Jews of the Diaspora already far outnumbered those of Palestine, who were still facing difficulties which might yet result in their extinction. From this point of view it is startling that almost all our literary remains of Judaism, of the period between Ezra and our Lord, come from Palestine. Esther seems the sole exception, and even this was probably written in Judæa. Still, it gives us a priceless glimpse of Persian Judaism.

The obstacles to belief in the historicity of Esther resolve themselves into three main lines. Firstly, there is the undoubted fact that the rabbis themselves hesitated a long time before they admitted the book to their canon. Secondly, it has been difficult to find a niche in history for the story. It is impossible to fit it in with the known details of the reign of Artaxerxes I., the successor of Xerxes I. (B.C. 465–425). Thirdly, the story itself is so wild and improbable, the motives of the actors so unlikely, the course of events so fantastic, the importance of the Jews so exaggerated, that the book was dismissed as a romance invented to explain the origin of a Jewish festival.

Already before Dr. Hoschander's investigations, the Elephantiné papyri had done something to clear away the second objection. They at least show clearly that something like Ahasuerus was the conventional Aramaic spelling

¹ See the *Jewish Quarterly*, 1920–22.

of the Greek Artaxerxes (Old Persian : Artakhshathra, Heb. : אֲחֶשְׁרוּשׁ, BA. : אֲרִתַּחֲשֶׁתָּא, Pap. : ארתהשש). A large number of these documents are dated : In the —th year of Ahasuerus, א' . . . שנת, and no distinction is ever made between Ahasuerus I. and his namesake Ahasuerus II. This at once suggests a solution of the difficulty in question. Will not the story fit in with the events of the reign of Ahasuerus II., to which a great many of the papyri belong ? This king reigned from 405 onwards. He is the very Artaxerxes so nearly defeated by his brother Cyrus and the Greek legion in the battle of Cunaxa, a story familiar to every schoolboy who has read the *Anabasis* of Xenophon. Is it not possible that Mordecai was a contemporary of Xenophon and Plato rather than of Sophocles and Pericles ? This, according to our author, is the key to the story. Once found, the other two objections melt away.

The third difficulty with regard to the fantastic nature of the events, actions and motives recorded, vanishes if we allow that we have in *Esther* the story of a persecuted minority told by themselves. Their own part in the play is naturally unduly magnified and the real motives of their antagonists, being completely dark to them, are strangely distorted, indeed replaced by others. And now the hesitation of the rabbis, our first difficulty, is equally explicable. Let us remember that the hero and heroine were extremely Persianised Jews. Esther herself bore the name of a Babylonian goddess, the great Ishtar. Her other name, Hadassa, is apparently the Persian Hutaosa, which the Greeks spelt Atossa. Mordecai carried the name of the national god of Babylon, Marduk. If under the Persian government many of the Jews were but casual in the observance of their religion, if they wore Persian dress, spoke Persian, even bore Persian or Babylonian names and

intermarried with foreigners—and the papyri prove all this—then nothing forbids, but everything inclines us to suppose that Mordecai and Esther were Jews of this type. And if they were of the laxer sort this may be the reason why the rabbis of the third or fourth century B.C. long delayed to write down the story, and when they finally were obliged to relate the history of their national hero and heroine they evaded the difficulty of exalting benefactors known to have been indifferent to the ritual which seemed to them the heart of religion, by writing the story but omitting the magic name of Jehovah (Pap. 17). One could not openly, so they felt, postulate God's guidance in the case of such characters. God is implied all through, but it would have been almost impious to mention Him by name in connexion with such (to them) irreligious personalities, however great, even noble, their political actions.

Our first and third obstacles give way together. The hesitation of the rabbis involved a long delay in committing the story to paper. Political circumstances had changed. The period of Ahasuerus II. was already in the dim and clouded past. The statesmanship of Vohuman the great vizier has become the petty spite of Haman. Is it possible to re-attain a clearer perspective to reconstruct events from the point of view, not of a persecuted race 150 years later, but of a Persian official at the time? This is what Dr. Hoschander has attempted.

The religious situation in the Persian empire in 400 B.C., as in the Roman empire in 200 A.D., may be understood best, perhaps, by a reference to comparatively modern times in our own history, to the days of Queen Elizabeth. Under Elizabeth attendance at the services of the national church was a mark and a test of political loyalty to the existing government. Men might hold what religious creed they pleased, provided that they conformed outwardly to

the worship, creed and ritual professed by the queen and maintained by public funds. At the national services prayer was offered for the queen and her ministers. In such official prayers it behoved all loyal Englishmen to join. And similarly in Persia in 400 B.C. It seems that after the shock of Cunaxa, when the weakness of the composite empire of the Achaemenides became manifest, the statesmen attached to that dynasty sought for some unifying principle, some one national cry, which would rally the various races and tribes under the one banner of Artaxerxes. Now the king himself and his nobles, of pure Persian stock, were worshippers of Ahuramazda, devotees of the same pure and intellectual faith which the Parsees profess to-day in Gujerat. But they rightly judged that this form of their religion was too refined to serve their purpose. Ahuramazda claimed a worship too spiritual, and with too little outward ritual, to attract the masses. They therefore resurrected from the past, or perhaps from contemporary provincial obscurity, and proclaimed as the patron goddess of the Achaemenian dynasty, Anahita, a deity still worshipped in some localities and whose rites were material, full of colour, music, ecstasy, feastings and sensuous pleasures. Once a year a special empire day was in future to be observed, when Anahita, as the genius and patroness of the ruling dynasty, would be worshipped with her appropriate ritual and at the same time enthusiasm for the empire and the reigning house would be fostered and developed. It is a device not unfamiliar in more modern empires, and perhaps not altogether to be despised—the appeal to the bond of a common history and a common faith—even though the processions and flags which it involves may evoke the scorn of the over-sophisticated. And the carrying-out of the plan was entrusted to the Grand Vizier Vohuman (the name is familiar in Middle Persian literature) whom the Jews knew as Haman.

That the worship of Anahita *was* thus revived and *established* by Artaxerxes II. seems indicated by his inscription at Susa, which runs as follows: "By the help of Ahuramazda I placed *Anahita* and Mithra in this temple. May Ahuramazda, Anahita and Mithra protect me."

Haman doubtless anticipated little or no opposition to the institution of one more public holiday. And if opposition were met, it could, from his point of view, be due to only one cause—disloyalty to the government, treachery to the throne. The religions of the empire were as various and heterogeneous as its populations. But the worship of Anahita involved no renunciation of other gods—that was an idea foreign to Haman and his friends as applicable to the generality of men, at least. No intolerance was intended. Men were simply asked to *add* a national worship to their own various faiths, not to abandon these. But Judaism, like the Christianity which grew from it, was an uncomfortable religion in this respect. "Jehovah your God is a jealous God." Thus ran the well-known slogan of the Jews. Jehovah tolerates no rivals. In consequence the proclamation of the new empire day involved persecution of the stricter and more pious Jews. As in all such tragic cases where the conscience (mistaken or otherwise) of individuals clashes with the policy of a government, there was no possibility of compromise where strict officials met severe devotees. Compromise existed doubtless in plenty of cases, probably in nineteen cases out of twenty. It happened thus during the Roman persecutions of Christians in the third century A.D. and in many other periods.

Some, for example, would remain in the country over the date of the festival; some would be present without actually worshipping. Some, more philosophic, would reflect that after all, the one God is worshipped under many

forms—what sin is there in outward conformity—the flesh profiteth nothing, it is the spirit which counts. But there always remains the twentieth man, the obstinate pighead or the faithful martyr, according to which side we happen to be on. In this case Haman received reports of such cases and no doubt ordered the execution of the persons concerned, as confessed traitors and malcontents. To his surprise this only increased the number of refusals. It began to dawn on him that the refusers were all Jews and that some *religious* principle or prejudice was involved.

Now the Jews were respected as capable and industrious colonists. Haman resolved on a policy of threats. He would give them time to think over the matter—to think better of it ; but they must eventually come in like the others. Accordingly he went through the elaborate ceremony of consulting the oracle as to a fit and propitious day for the next annual festival. This settled, a good nine months ahead to give space for reflection, he issued a proclamation that refusal to comply with the decree at the next ensuing festival would involve the death penalty. He thus hoped to avoid further trouble, for he had not yet fathomed the depth and strength of Jewish fanaticism—or faith.

Thus far Haman, an official concerned with high policy. What of Mordecai and Esther ? The first, no doubt by favour of his relation to the queen, had become an officer of the bodyguard. Neither he nor his cousin had “showed their people or kindred.” They were not of the narrower, sterner section, and were willing enough to pass as Persians in normal times. But when reports of the executions ordered by Haman reached Mordecai, blood proved thicker than water. He began to conceive a fierce hatred for the persecutor of his brethren, men whom he knew to be perfectly loyal to the government and whose punishment he therefore set down to either race hatred or arbitrary acts

of sheer cruelty on the part of the Grand Vizier. He refused the customary salute, and Haman, when his attention was called to this, naturally made the usual application to the king to allow the imposition of the death penalty on a disloyal officer.

The remainder of the story is familiar to us. It is told, of course, from the point of view of a persecuted minority, and no doubt is less than fair to Haman. We may guess, for instance, that as the height of the gallows he had erected has been dramatically exaggerated, so have his other actions doubtless been equally distorted. What seems certain is that Haman was dismissed from office and that Mordecai took his place, and that then, the true objection of the stricter Jews being explained to the king, means were found to evade the law in their case, when once the government, now directed by a Jew, was assured of their loyalty to the throne. We know that a Jew—Nehemiah—had been first royal cupbearer and subsequently a provincial governor a generation or so before. There is no intrinsic reason to doubt the story of Mordecai in this respect, any more than to throw doubt on the queenship of Esther. The misunderstanding of an intensely religious attitude on the part of a government concerned quite sincerely to secure loyalty, has been paralleled even in modern times.

The final scene between Artaxerxes, Haman and Harbonah is presented with a terse brevity which brings out all its theatrical possibilities. No wonder, we feel as we read it, that the story was seized on by Racine, that master of classic stagecraft, as the material for one of his greatest creations. Those who have seen this play staged by a good French company can testify to its thrilling quality. And the very fact may appear to argue against the historicity of the events recorded. Yet the actions and speeches of the king, the vizier and the chamberlain are in perfect

accordance with the constitution of an oriental court. Haroun ur-Rashīd had not only his vizier but his chamberlain. The situation in an Indian native state to-day is analogous. We have the hereditary ruler, rajah, nizām, nawāb, the nominal head of the state who may or may not be a man of real ability. The head of the actual administration is the diwān or chief minister, often a personage of comparatively humble origin who has risen by his own quality to a position of power, which, however, he holds subject to the favour, or rather frequently to the caprice, of the rajah. But beside these there is always the head of the royal household, a eunuch, perhaps, in former times a slave by status, yet a person of immense importance. For it is on this man that the rajah's life depends. He is the real barrier between the monarch and a death by poison, and the latter dare not offend him. Often this official, the chamberlain of our English O.T. stories, is an entirely uneducated lacquey in mind ; but he has the cunning and craft of the lacquey in superlative measure. It is by such qualities that he has attained his position.

Here then we have the situation in the closing chapters of Esther. Vohuman, the highly educated, intelligent and broad-minded nobleman, the great political minister who yet holds office subject to the fitful whim and arbitrary will of a weak and irresponsible despot. On the other side Harbonah the chamberlain, a master of intrigue, whose horizon is limited to the advantages and advancement of himself and his personal friends, and who has a hold over the king which no minister can ever have. How admirably these two types of character are illustrated here. Harbonah, the wily flunkey, watches shrewdly to see on which side the cat will jump, quick to make personal profit from the political bouleversement. Vohuman's star is falling ; it is enough ; Harbonah is the first to desert him and to call

attention to the wrongs of Mordecai, the new luminary. Standing at the royal elbow and accustomed to divine his master's mind with lightning quickness from his facial changes, he sees the frown and murmurs craftily, "Behold also the gallows, fifty cubits high . . ." נִסְּה הָנָה הָעֵץ . . . גְּבוּהַ חֲמִשִּׁים אַמָּה. He had touched the right note. The king's fury finds vent and in a moment with heartless Oriental wit comes the reply, "Hang him thereon." תִּלְהוּ עָלָיו.

What of the dramatic chain of events which make possible the final discomfiture of Haman and the elevation of Mordecai? It is—as recently pointed out in an interesting article in the EXPOSITOR—a succession of apparently unconnected occurrences which turn out a sequence of ordered guidance alike of a nation's and of an individual's destinies. There is Mordecai's discovery of the plot to assassinate the king; there is the fact that this event was recorded yet unrewarded; there is the strange sleeplessness of Artaxerxes; there is his choice of the archives as a diversion. And yet all of these are perfectly possible. It is not at all unlikely that one of the maidens brought in with Esther had been abducted by force resulting in the death of a relative. Very likely Bigthan,¹ and Teresh made their plot as the result of a blood-feud contracted in this way. Esther would hear of it from her companions and thus warn Mordecai, before she herself became queen or he a pensioner of the government. The other events are equally explicable. And they illustrate that *faith in divine guidance* which is one of the most precious doctrines of Judaism and of Christianity alike. Have we not most of us experiences of the same kind equally startling to ourselves if less poignantly dramatic? How natural too is the mixture of paganism and Judaism in Esther and her relative! "Who

¹ This name appears in Egypt in 428 B.C., under the form בִּגְתָן, as that of a subordinate official of the Persian Government in that country.

knoweth whether thou art come to the kingdom for such a time as this ? " Such is Mordecai's question, a sentence inspired by this same doctrine of the guiding hand of God. Yet in Esther's reply, " If I perish, I perish," there lurks some of the pagan fatalism which survives under Judaism and Christianity in most of us.

The book of Esther then not only throws light on the Jewish communities in Persia during a most interesting period, but it also illustrates a cardinal difference between the Jewish-Christian view of history and that of non-Christians, the *doctrine of guidance*, which carries with it that stress on the value of the individual so characteristic of both the older and the later religion.

It would be interesting to speculate on the possibility that the extraordinary favour shown to the Jews by the Persian government during this period—a favour which made possible the mission of Ezra, and which is witnessed to by the papyri—was due to Esther and the viziership of Mordecai. It is certain that royal orders were issued to the Egyptian garrisons regarding the passover at one time, and the Persian kings were certainly directly interested in the Jewish religion during the fifth and fourth centuries, and even earlier.¹

In any case Dr. Hoschander's theories seem worthy of more notice than has yet been accorded to them. In a belief that his explanation of Haman's apparently fantastic actions is at least more than possible this article has been written. If it stimulates any interest in the study of Old Persian religion and of the Jews of the Diaspora the writer will be more than repaid, believing as he does that such studies are very relevant to a full understanding of the religious developments which preceded the appearance of Christianity.

JOHN P. NAISH.

¹ From the time of Cambyses, according to the papyri.

THE SIGN OF JONAH.

THIS "Sign," this "speaking miracle," is thrice mentioned in our New Testament Scriptures—in St. Matthew xii. 39, St. Matthew xvi. 4, and St. Luke xi. 29. These are indeed the only places where the Prophet Jonah is mentioned at all in the New Testament. It is, moreover, certain that Christian readers are not by any means clear or unanimous as to what the "Sign of Jonah" really was, or rather, as to how, and in what sense, he "became a sign unto the Ninevites." For it is certain from a comparison of Scriptures that Jonah himself was the "sign" vouchsafed to the Ninevites, just as the Son of Man was to be *the* sign to that generation; only, of course, in a deeper and wider sense.

If a number of Christian people were suddenly asked *how* the prophet became a "sign" to the Ninevites, they would probably all answer, "Oh, of course, because he was swallowed by a 'whale'—a sea-monster of sorts—and lived for three days and three nights inside the creature, and was then disgorged alive upon the dry land." The more learned in the Scriptures among them would quote St. Matthew xii. 40 as practically settling the question. Putting this verse aside, to be considered presently, does any one seriously think that Jonah, when he got to Nineveh, told the people there of his adventure with "the whale"? If he had, they would only have laughed at him, and told him he was mad. Very naturally, too; we should have done the same. Moreover, they would have perceived, after very little consideration, that the episode of the "whale" had nothing to do with them: whatever it was, it belonged to Jonah's own religious history; it had nothing to do with the Ninevites. Much is uncertain about Jonah. Indeed some critics are rash enough (as I venture to think) to say that he is altogether mythical; but at any rate we may be

satisfied that the whale did not follow him to Nineveh; that the Ninevites never heard of it. What then? How did Jonah become a sign to the Ninevites? Let us see. The only other Old Testament reference to Jonah is in 2 Kings xiv. 25, from which we learn that the Prophet was of Gath-hepher. Now Gath-hepher was in Galilee. Here we may note in passing the ignorance and impudence of the Chief Priests and Pharisees in St. John vii. 45-52, who wanted to ignore the fact that this great Prophet arose "out of Galilee." What, then, was Galilee? It was the northernmost section of the northern kingdom, the kingdom of Israel (as contrasted with Judah), and therefore the first part to be overrun and laid waste by the enemies of Israel. These enemies were, first, the Syrians, whose capital was Damascus, who raided Galilee in the days of Jehoahaz; and, second, the Assyrians, hailing from Nineveh, who completed the work of destruction, and finally captured Samaria in the ninth year of King Hoshea. These Assyrians, who were also a Semitic race, like the Syrians and the Hebrews, and spoke a cognate language, are very well known to us by their sculptures and pictures. Their soldiers were first-rate fighting men, very brave, well-disciplined, formidable—but very cruel. Their methods of warfare were ruthless, very like those of the Turks and Kurds to-day. When they fell upon a town or a village in Galilee, we may be sure they would treat the wretched inhabitants much as the Turks have treated the inhabitants of so many an Armenian, or East-Syrian, or other (Christian) village in Asia Minor. Let us suppose, then—it is, indeed no improbable supposition, but quite the contrary—that the Assyrians have fallen upon the village of Gath-hepher during one of Jonah's absences from home; say the last, when he tried to flee to Tarshish "from the presence of the Lord." What will he find of his home, his boyhood's home, which he had loved so well? A heap of blackened ruins—that is

all. And what will he learn of the fate of his own nearest and dearest, if he find any survivor from the general massacre to tell him ? His father and mother slain with the sword ; his brothers, because they showed fight, tortured to death ; his sisters all outraged, and then flung aside to die of misery, shame and hunger. Such was Jonah's last memory of what had been his home, and with this memory fresh upon him he "arose and went to Nineveh." He went, because he just had to ; because he had found out that it was quite useless to dream of disobeying the voice of the Lord. Jonah has lost everything—his property, his home, his friends ; I do not suppose he has sixpence in his pocket. So, if he goes, he must just tramp it and beg his way, his daily bread, his nightly shelter. And all along that weary way the good-natured people who feed him and take him in will look at him with amazement as they hear the unmistakable Hebrew accent with which he speaks. They will exclaim, "Why ! this man is a Hebrew : nay, he is a Hebrew of Galilee—the very country our troops have wasted, for his speech bewrayeth him," (as it did St. Peter long afterwards). Truly we have served this man, his home, his kindred, very ill ; and now he goes to our capital city, to Nineveh, with a message of warning (surely of warning) from his God. If they will but listen and repent, surely his God will spare them." So they passed him on, with favourable messages, until at last he reached Nineveh, and "became a sign to the Ninevites." These people of Nineveh, as they listen to his voice, getting further and fainter towards the central spaces of their wide-lying city : as they listen, I say, to the monotonous "Prophetic" cadence, with its queer Galilean-Hebrew intonation, with which he repeats ever again his message "yet forty days, and Nineveh shall be overthrown" : they could not see into his heart, of course ; could not see the rebellion towards God, the bitterness towards man, which were there. *We* can, because we

have this priceless book, which bears the name of "Jonah," in our hands. They only saw the poor, ragged Hebrew Prophet in their midst, and supposed (naturally enough) that there was the same love, the same forgiveness, in his heart as in his mission and his message. It was just this, I take it, this sense of his mission—he being what he was—which so moved the Ninevites that they all repented after their fashion. No one will, of course, pretend to say that their "repentance" meant much, or lasted long. Probably its most pronounced effect was to send up the price of sackcloth enormously, and to cause acute discomfort to all the animals in Nineveh. But in its heathenish way it *was* worth something; it served as a welcome excuse (so Jonah would have said) for God in His great goodness to spare that great and wicked city any such spectacular overthrow as He had threatened it with. Instead whereof it was left to that slow decay, that final extinction, which is the inevitable fate of every abnormal aggregation of human life apart from human industry or commerce. The grass-grown mounds, which mark the site of that great city upon the Tigris, have many a true thing to teach us both from the point of view of the Divine goodness, and from that of political economy, "As Jonah was a sign to the Ninevites: so shall the Son of Man be to this generation." It is easy enough to trace the parallel. Did he not come, friendless and helpless, and place Himself wholly at the mercy of a people who had shown themselves bitterly hostile to Him and His? Did He not come, all unprotected and defenceless, to a city which had ever persecuted His Prophets and stoned His messengers? With a message, outwardly, of extinction (St. Luke xix. 41–44), but inwardly of pardon, peace and favour. And was not this message of His "*urbi et orbi*," chiefly commended to this (and every other) generation by the character, lineage and nationality of the messenger? Jesus, Himself, the sign of signs, the miracle of miracles!

The everlasting Son of the Father, the Maker of this great and splendid world and of a thousand worlds far greater and more splendid than this, a homeless wanderer, not having where to lay His Head, dependent for daily food upon the charity of kindly strangers! This same Jesus, of the Gospels, of the Creeds, one with the Father, "Who for us men, and for our salvation, came down from heaven, and was made man, and was crucified for us under Pontius Pilate," is *the* sign to this (and every other) generation, that God is eternally good, is ready to pardon everything, is Himself heavenly Love and Pity and Patience.

It will, however, be said in answer to this reading of Jonah's mission to the Ninevites, that there is another passage in St. Matthew's Gospel (xii. 39-41), in which our Lord says, "For as Jonah was three days and three nights in the belly of the whale, so shall the Son of Man be three days and three nights in the heart of the earth." Quite correct, and at first sight conclusive. But there are certain things to be considered. First, *it is not true* that our Lord was "three days and three nights" in the sepulchre; at least, if it *is* true, then the universal tradition and belief of Christendom, enshrined in our Creeds and hymns, is wrong. This tradition and belief, to the effect that He was crucified on a Friday, buried the same evening, and rose again very early on the Sunday, has behind it the express assertion of St. John (xix. 31, 42; xx. 1, 19) with the general concurrence of the other Gospels (St. Matt. xvi. 21; xx. 19, xxviii. 6; St. Mark xv. 42, xvi. 9; St. Luke ix. 22, xxiii. 54, xxiv. 1, 7, 21, 46). On the other hand, there are traces of a tradition which allowed of a longer interval (St. Mark viii. 31, ix. 31, x. 34; St. Matt. xxvii. 63; but "after three days" *may* refer to the last hours of Friday and the first of Sunday as if they were separate "days"). It is not, however, allowable to affirm that the Jewish use of time expressions was so vague and inaccurate as to be

practically unreliable. "Three days and three nights" cannot anyhow be considered an equivalent of *one* day with two little bits of days added on, and two nights. Either then, on the assumption that he spoke as in St. Matthew xii. 40, He was crucified on a Thursday, *or* He expected to remain buried three days and three nights, *and was mistaken*. Both these conclusions are very difficult. Personally, if I were driven to it, I should prefer the latter, because our Lord was truly human (as well as Divine), and because there is distinct recognition in Scripture of a shortening of a (pre-determined) period "for the elect's sake, whom he chose" (St. Mark xiii. 20 ; St. Matt. xxiv. 22).

But, secondly, there is another thing to be considered—the fact, viz., that the Christians of the first and second centuries were greatly impressed with the escape of Jonah from the belly of the whale as an illustration, or type, of our Lord's Resurrection. No one can have given heed to the rough frescoes found in the catacombs at Rome without becoming aware of this. These frescoes do indeed confirm us in the impression (gained on other and better ground) that these "early Christians" were people of a singularly unintelligent, uncritical and ill-educated type. They were splendid; but they would not be safe guides on a question of Old Testament criticism. They took every word of "Jonah" at the foot of the letter, and were sure that his story was miraculously fore-ordained to show forth the death, burial and rising again of our Lord. What more natural than that a marginal note to the same effect as St. Matthew xii. 40 should creep into the text of one of the earliest copies of the completed Gospel? But this (it will be said) is a mere guess, for there is no copy which has not this verse in full. Let us, then, consider the character of this premier Gospel, which we call after the name of the Apostle, St. Matthew. It is a commonplace of New Testament criticism, founded on good authority, that the Apostle collected the

discourses of our Lord, publishing them at first in Hebrew (i.e. Aramaic), the native tongue of the Apostle, and (probably) of our Lord Himself. But the *narrative* portions of the first Gospel—in which xii. 40 occurs—are taken (with considerable variety of detail, and with some considerable additions of which we do not know the source) from the parallel narrative in the second Gospel. It cannot be supposed that an Apostle would thus borrow the narrative of an “Apostolic man” like St. Mark; and so it has been generally concluded that the discourses were interwoven with the narrative, and the Gospel brought into its present state, by some Christian Jew—perhaps in the “mountain” country beyond Jordan during the last siege of Jerusalem. But there is more than this. Internal evidence cries aloud to all who will allow themselves to listen, that the “redactor” of this premier Gospel was a man of little intelligence or education: “ignorant and unlearned” (in the sense of Acts iv. 13)—“not having learned letters” (in the sense of St. John vii. 15), but lacking the native wisdom which made St. John capable of becoming so great a theologian. St. Matthew ii. 23 is sufficient proof of this. There is no such text in the Old Testament, nor is there anything at all to connect our Lord with Nazareth. St. Matthew xxiii. 35 and xxvii. 9 contain verbal blunders (they are nothing more) which sufficiently indicate the mental equipment of the writer. Put these three things together. First, the known literary character of the man responsible for the narrative portions of the first Gospel; second, the fact that at Rome, and amongst the very ill-educated majority of the Christians there, the disgorging of Jonah was considered a striking similitude of the Resurrection; third, the fact that, unless He was mistaken, our Lord *could not* have committed Himself to the statement in St. Matthew xii. 40, inasmuch as He did not remain in the tomb “three days and three nights.” My own conclusion from these three considerations is that

St. Matthew xii. 40 is an interpolation, of unknown (but easily surmised) origin, for which our Lord is not responsible. This conclusion is confessedly a difficult one. It is open to any one to reject it. Only, if he decide to accept xii. 40 as genuine, he must *not* rely upon the easy conviction that all Hebrew expressions for the lapse of time mean anything you like: he must be prepared to believe either (*a*) that our Lord was crucified on a Thursday: or (*b*) that He was mistaken when he said "three days and three nights."

RAYNER WINTERBOTHAM.

THE HOPE OF IMMORTALITY IN THE PSALTER.

THIS paper is intended to give an affirmative answer to the question: Is there any hope of immortality in the Psalter? Not indeed that this hope is a prominent feature of the Psalms. We have already seen that there are certain Psalms which manifest what we might almost call hopelessness in the presence of death, and there are other passages too of a like kind. Thus in Psalm vi. 5 we have:

In death there is no remembrance of thee:
In hell who shall give thee thanks?

And again in Psalm cxv. 17:

The dead praise not the LORD,
Nor any that go down into silence.

But there are four Psalms which it seems to me do contain the hope of immortality. There is in them the hope of a deliverance out of death into the presence of God Himself.

These four Psalms, which I will set out in their entirety, differ widely in their form and subject matter, but they are all alike in one particular, namely, that in each of them God Himself is presented as the Psalmist's good. In each he is "rich toward God." It is not surprising then that the hope of immortality should emerge in these particular Psalms, for if a man's good consists not in the things of the

world, why may he not hope to find it when he passes out of this life ?

We will begin with a translation of Psalm xvi.

1. Preserve me, O God,
For in thee do I put my trust.
2. I have said to Jehovah, Thou art my Lord,
I have no good beyond thee.
3. And as for the saints that are in the earth,
They are the excellent, in whom is all my delight.
4. Their sorrows shall increase who exchange for another :
I will not pour their offerings of blood,
Nor take their names on my lips.
5. Jehovah is the portion of mine inheritance, and my cup :
Thou maintainest my lot.
6. The lines are fallen to me in pleasant places :
I have truly a goodly heritage.
7. I will bless the LORD who hath given me counsel :
Yea in the night my reins instruct me.
8. I have set the LORD continually before me :
Because he is on my right hand, I shall not be moved.
9. Therefore my heart is glad, and my glory rejoiceth :
My flesh too shall dwell in safety ;
10. For thou wilt not leave my soul to hell,
Nor suffer thy holy ¹ one to see corruption.
11. Thou wilt show me the path of life :
There is fulness of joy in thy presence,
And pleasures in thy right hand for éver.

We shall all remember the use which is made of this Psalm in Acts xiii. 35-37, where St. Paul in his preaching at Antioch treats it as prophetic of the resurrection of Jesus. And this is right enough. But the Psalm must have meant something to him who originally composed it, whether this be David himself or another. It is the expression of a personal hope, and this is certainly not that he would continue in this life for ever and never pass through death. He expects to go to "hell," but God will not *leave* him to that. For this word "leave" must be given its proper meaning and not be treated as if it were equivalent

¹ Or "favoured one."

to "give." Out of what the dismal word Sheol connoted God would deliver him.

We will next take Psalm xvii., the last verse of which has I think an important bearing on the subject before us, and the context must be seen to appreciate the force of this particular verse.

PSALM XVII.

1. Hear the right, O LORD,
Attend thou unto my cry :
Give ear unto my prayer,
That cometh not from feigned lips.
2. Let my sentence come forth from thy presence,
And thine eyes behold in equity.
3. Thou hast proved my heart, thou hast visited by night,
Thou hast tried me, and shalt not find :
For I am purposed my mouth shall not transgress.
4. And as for men's doings, by the word of thy lips
I have kept me from the ways of the violent.
5. My steps have kept to thy paths,
My feet have not slipped.
6. Therefore do I call to thee, for thou wilt answer me, O God :
Incline me thine ear, and hear my speech.
7. Let thy marvellous kindness be shewn to save
Them that trust thy right hand against their adversaries.
8. Keep me as the apple of the eye :
Hide me under the shadow of thy wings
9. From the face of the wicked that would spoil me,
My deadly enemies that compass me round :
10. Men enclosed in their fat,
And whose mouth speaketh in pride.
11. They have now compassed our steps :
They set their eyes to cast us to earth,
12. Like a lion that is greedy of his prey,
Like a young lion lurking in secret.
13. Arise, O LORD, confront him, bring him down :
Deliver my soul by thy sword from the wicked ;
14. From men, with thy hand, O LORD :
From men of the world, with their portion in life,
And whose bellies thou fillest with thy treasure.
They are satisfied with children,
And they settle what they leave upon their babes.
15. But I, by righteousness, will behold thy presence,
And be satisfied, on awaking, with thy likeness.

This is a fine climax, only possible to one who had the clear consciousness that, in contrast to the men of the world, whose portion was in this life, he had made God his good, and that it was His presence that he ardently desired. That presence he realises partially in this life, but when he awakes (and what can this mean, unless it refers to an awakening from the sleep of death ?) he will be fully satisfied with God's "likeness." What meaning exactly the Psalmist attached to this word we cannot definitely determine, but he hoped to see God.

We come now to a Psalm of a different character altogether.

PSALM XLIX.

1. Hearken to this, all ye peoples,
Give ear, all ye that dwell in the world ;
2. Ye that are low, ye that are high,
Rich and poor together.
3. My mouth shall speak of wisdom,
And the musing of my heart be of understanding.
4. I will incline mine ears to a parable,
I will open my dark saying on the harp.
5. Why should I fear in the days of evil,
When the iniquity of my supplanters encompasseth me ?
6. They that trust in their wealth,
And boast of the multitude of their riches,
7. None of them can redeem his brother,
Nor pay his ransom to God ;
8. For the redemption of the soul is costly,
And it hath ceased for ever
9. That one should live alway
And should not see the pit.
10. Though they see that wise men die,
And the foolish and brutish perish together,
And leave their riches to others ;
11. Yet they think that their houses are for ever,
Their dwelling places unto all generations,
And they call their lands by their own names.
12. But man in honour abideth not,
He is even like to the beasts that perish.
13. This their way is their foolishness,
And yet their posterity approve their sayings.

14. They are appointed to hell like sheep with death as their shepherd,
 And in the morning the righteous shall have dominion over them :
 And their form, which hell shall consume, is without habitation.
15. But God will redeem my soul from the hand of hell,
 For he shall take me.
16. Then fear not if one be made rich,
 If the glory of his house be increased.
17. For naught shall he take away when he dieth,
 And his glory descendeth not after him.
18. Though he blessed his own soul while he lived,
 (And men praise thee when all goeth well)
 He shall go ¹ to the generation of his fathers,
 Who nevermore see the light.
19. Man that hath honour and no understanding
 Is even like to the beasts that perish.

It will be seen that in my translation I connect verse 9 with the words that immediately precede, and I do not take verse 8, as in A.V. and R.V., as parenthetical. The rhythm seems to require that we should read straight on from verse 8 to verse 9. Moreover, the translation of the second half of verse 8 in the R.V. ("And must be let alone for ever") does not seem to me grammatically possible. The correct translation is, "And it hath ceased for ever," and the only question is, What has ceased? Is it the redemption of the soul or is it that which follows in verse 9? I understand it to be the latter.

It is the fifteenth verse which specially concerns us here. Surely in view of what the Psalmist has said earlier (*v.* 10) of the universality of death, which carries off all alike, the wise as well as the foolish and brutish, it cannot for a moment be supposed that he expects to be an exception. His expectation is not that he shall avoid Sheol altogether but that God will "redeem" him from its hand or power, and will take him to Himself. And we may remark in passing that the word for "take" is the same which is used

¹ Literally "Thou shalt go."

in Genesis v. 24 of Enoch, of whom it is said : *He was not, for God took him.*

We come lastly to Psalm lxxiii., which like xlix. is didactic in character, and like it too is concerned with the difficult problem of the prosperity of the wicked in this life.

PSALM LXXIII.

1. Truly God is good unto Israel,
To those of a pure heart.
2. And yet my feet were almost gone,
My steps had well nigh slipped ;
3. Because I was envious at the arrogant,
I saw the wicked in peace.
4. For there are no bands in their death,
But their strength continueth firm.
5. They are not in trouble like others,
Nor as other men are they plagued.
6. Therefore pride is their necklace,
Violence covereth them as a robe.
7. Their eyes stand out with fatness,
The imaginations of their heart overflow.
8. They scoff, and speak in wickedness,
They speak of oppression with pride.
9. They have set their mouth in the heavens,
And their tongue walketh through the earth.
10. Therefore do his people turn to them,
And full cups of water are drained by them.
11. And they say, How doth God know ?
And, Is there knowledge in the Most High ?
12. Lo, these are the wicked,
And they wax rich in continual ease.
13. Surely in vain have I cleansed my heart,
And washed my hands in innocency ;
14. For all day long am I plagued,
And chastened every morning.
15. But had I said, I will so declare,
Then lo, I had betrayed the generation of thy children.
16. But as I thought for to understand it,
It seemed unto me but labour,
17. Until I entered the sanctuary of God,
And considered their latter end.
18. Verily thou settest them in slippery places,
And castest them down in ruin.
19. How do they become a desolation in a moment !
They are utterly consumed with terrors.

20. Like as a dream when one awaketh,
Thou LORD, on awaking, wilt scorn their image.
21. But though my heart was grieved,
And I was pricked in my reins,
22. Yet was I brutish and ignorant,
I was like to a beast before thee.
23. Nevertheless I am alway with thee,
Thou hast holden my right hand.
24. Thou wilt guide me with thy counsel,
And afterward take me to glory.
25. Whom have I in heaven ?
And I desire none on earth, beside thee.
26. My flesh and my heart faileth,
But God is the strength of my heart, and my portion for ever.
27. For lo they shall perish, who are far from thee,
Thou destroyest all them that are faithless toward thee.
28. But for me, it is good to draw near unto God :
I have made the Lord Jehovah my refuge,
And will tell of all thy doings.

The author of this Psalm, while deeply conscious of his own imperfections, and ashamed of any doubts he may have had of God's justice, is sure of his own desire after God, and he is persuaded that God will not abandon him, but will lead him on to glory. Some see in this word "glory" in verse 24 nothing but "honour," and it is not to be denied that the word is used of honour, of worldly honour. But such an interpretation would ill suit the context here. The Psalmist is conscious of God's continual presence with him in this life and knows that it is God that has held him up. Of this guidance he is sure even to the end, and then "afterward" God will take him to glory. We have the same word here for "take" as in Psalm xlix. 15.

The four Psalms then which I have set out in this paper seem to me the refutation of those who deny that there is any hope of immortality in the Psalter. In particular the "awaking" spoken of in xvii. 15, and the "afterward" of lxxiii. 24, are most naturally explained if we look beyond death, and recognise the hope of a life eternal.

E. H. ASKWITH.

THE APOSTOLIC DECREE AND ITS PROBLEMS.

(b) THE TEXTUAL PROBLEM.

THE textual problem of the Apostolic Decree is in the first instance a problem of the Western Text.¹ The "Tübingen School," in whose theories the Apostolic Council had so prominent a place, never took any notice of the important various readings of the Decree afforded by the Codex Bezae and its allies, nor outside of the circle of this School was much attention paid to the "eccentricities" of the Western Text. Gradually, however, the position has changed. Rendel Harris in England and Blass in Germany—to mention only these names standing for many others—have drawn this Text into the field of diligent research, and at the present time it looks very much as if the stone refused by the builders will prove to be the corner-stone of New Testament textual criticism.

It is generally admitted now that the Western Text represents an earlier text-form than the great Uncials; and the opinion is gradually gaining ground that we have in it a textual tradition the origin of which lies in Rome during the middle of the second century or even previously. In his masterly book on Marcion² Harnack has shown that Marcion read his New Testament in a Western recension

¹ The literature on the subject is immense. For a clear and concise statement of the problem it may suffice to refer, for instance, to Sanday, "The Apostolic Decree," in *Theologische Studien Theodor Zahn dargebracht*, Leipzig, 1908, S. 317-338, and Sanday, "The Text of the Ap. Decree," in the *EXPOSITOR*, VIII 6 (1913), pp. 289-305.

² Adolf von Harnack, *Marcion, das Evangelium vom fremden Gott*, Leipzig, 1921.

and this not only in Greek, but possibly also in a Latin translation. Even if the latter thesis must remain undecided, it may be regarded as absolutely certain that since the middle of the second century the Western Text has reigned almost undisputed for centuries in Rome and in the Churches dependent on Rome. In a recent study Diehl has traced also the first scholarly revision of the early Latin *Apostolos* to Rome, viz., to Novatian, the first Roman Christian author writing literary Latin. That the early Latin translation has its origin in a period in which Latin was used only by the lower un-literary classes, is shown by its vulgarisms, which so often are corrected by Tertullian in a parallel translation into literary Latin.¹ Accordingly from this side also the high antiquity of the Western Text becomes obvious. Even in its vulgarisms the Western Text is likely to be nearer to the original than the scholarly revision represented by the great Uncials. This circumstance must needs be of greater weight than hitherto has been acknowledged, when we come to settle the probably original text.

With regard to Acts the problem is somewhat more complicated and difficult than in the case of the Gospels and of the Pauline Epistles. Marcion rejected this book; in his canon, therefore, the book does not appear. It is doubtful whether before Marcion any "canonical" collection of New Testament writings, properly so called, existed. That, however, the early Catholic Church accepted the second Lukan work along with the Gospel by the same author, may be regarded as beyond doubt. For this reason we may safely assume that the Western Text of Acts represents as early a tradition as that of any other part of the New Testament.

The divergences, however, of the Western tradition are in

¹ Cf. von Harnack, *Marcion*, S. 47*-54*.

Acts much greater, and are also—at least partly—of another type than in the other parts of the New Testament. It is impossible to discuss this important problem here. I can only say that at present I do not see any other plausible solution for it than that proposed by Blass and defended by Zahn,¹ namely, that in the two recensions of Acts we have two editions, both issued by the author; and that while the Western Text as a whole represents the first edition, the other so called “Neutral” Text is a revision. Especially the fact that even in materially different points they never essentially contradict each other, together with the decidedly Lucan style of the Western additions, seem to me to exclude any solution which does not make Luke responsible for both text-forms.

We might have put this theory aside and have confined ourselves to the actual data of the textual tradition of the Apostolic Decree, had not the exclusive acceptance of either the Western or the Eastern recension hitherto formed the basis of discussion. Formerly the text of the great Uncials was received as the only correct form of the Decree. Since Resch's book on the extra-canonical text of the Apostolic Decree,² this latter has risen in the estimation of scholars, and many (Lake for instance) regard it as the original. We shall see that on this basis a theory has been founded which is contrary to the explicit data of the history of the Decree in the early Church and which to my mind has vitiated the whole discussion of the problem and has rendered impossible a sound understanding of the situation in Acts xv.

The two latest writers on the subject, Alfred Wikenhauser

¹ Cf. Zahn, *Einleitung*, II. 3^e Aufl., S. 341–365; and Zahn, *Forschungen*, IX. “Die Herausgabe der Apostelgeschichte des Lucas,” Leipzig, 1916.

² Gotthold Resch, *Das Aposteldecree nach seiner ausserkanonischen Textgestalt*, Leipzig, 1905.

(*Die Apostelgeschichte und ihr Geschichtswert*, Münster i. W., 1921, S. 215), and J. Gresham Machen (*The Origin of Paul's Religion*, New York, 1921, p. 90) assert that, in this case at least, the theory of a twofold recension is impossible because there can have been only one form of the Decree. They are absolutely right in so far that if there are two Lucan recensions, they cannot differ in meaning. But when they say that for this reason there can be but one Lucan recension they forget that in Luke's narrative we certainly do not have a literal transcript of the Apostolic Letter, but only an abbreviated, though trustworthy rendering of it. That Luke could not in a second edition have added a word by which an ambiguous expression might be explained more clearly, or have omitted something which seemed superfluous, is by no means evident. If really the two text-forms originate with the author himself, the problem acquires a quite different aspect, and we shall be obliged to find an explanation which accounts for both. We shall see whether this is actually possible.

1. The Western Text *omits*: τοῦ πικτοῦ;

2. The Western Text *inserts* the Golden Rule;

3. The Western Text *inserts* the words: *γερόμενοι ἐν τῷ ἀγῶνι πνεύματι* after the words *εὖ πράξετε*. Before the appearance of Resch's book the general opinion was that the one really important variant was the omission of τοῦ πικτοῦ; this omission was then followed or was already accompanied by the insertion of the Golden Rule. The original text according to this view was a four-clause Decree containing a set of ritual regulations imposed upon the Gentile Christians as a kind of compromise: in these particular points at least the Gentile Christians ought to submit themselves to the obligations of the Law. The omission of τοῦ πικτοῦ and the insertion of the Golden Rule were designed to change this originally ritual code

into a simple moral catechism forbidding idolatry, murder and fornication, and putting the whole of the Christian life under the authority of the Golden Rule. The change was made at a time when ritual obligations were no longer understood.

Resch, on the other hand, denies that ever *πικτόν* belonged to the forbidden things in Judaism; that accordingly the three-clause Decree was the original form; when, however, in later times the abstinence from blood and things strangled came into use, first in the Eastern Churches and thence also in the West, the original moral Decree was changed into a ritual code by the insertion of *τοῦ πικτοῦ*. So the conflict in Antioch and in Jerusalem ended, according to Resch and those who follow his theory, in a complete triumph for Paul.

It might be remarked that in the latter case the Apostolic Decree contains hardly any definite point explicitly bearing on the particular form of the conflict. At all events the first thing necessary will be closely to inquire into the actual critical and historical data, seeing that it is generally believed that the two text-forms mutually exclude each other. Even Zahn in his reconstruction of the "Urausgabe" has received the *πικτόν* in the original Greek, though omitting the "suffocatum" in the early Latin.

For his list of variations in which the Decree occurs Resch has distinguished between the three-clause Decree as a moral code and the four-clause Decree as a food-law. This distinction indeed constitutes the principle of his classification. It is clear that if this principle be accepted as valid, conclusive proof must be given that the three-clause Decree was understood as a moral code, and that its later application as a "food-law" was a wrong interpretation.

What are the facts ? It is important to state them quite clearly.

Throughout the Western Church the Decree was read and transmitted in its three-clause form, generally including the Golden Rule also. So by Tertullian and Cyprian in Africa, by Ambrosiaster in Rome, by Irenæus in Gallia, by Pacianus in Spain. Irenæus, our earliest witness, reads the three-clause text both in the original Greek and in the Latin translation, and this not only in Acts xv. 29, but also in xv. 20. In his discussion of the narrative of Acts xv. (*Adv. Haer.* III. xii. 12 sqq.) Irenæus tries to show that there are differences between the Old Covenant and the New, but that at the same time they are in perfect harmony. Then he quotes the addresses of Peter and James, and the Apostolic Epistle, and concludes by saying that the Apostles "gave the New Testament of freedom to those who recently (*nove*) believed in God through the Holy Spirit." At the same time, however, he says that "the question whether circumcision is necessary or not ? being put, shows clearly that they had no different idea of God. They were, however, not so much afraid for the first (i.e. the Old) Testament as to refuse to eat with the Gentiles. The Apostles who were with James (*hi qui circa Jacobum apostoli*) permitted the Gentiles to act freely and commended them to the Spirit of God. They themselves, however, though knowing the same God, persevered in the former observances (*per-severabant in pristinis observationibus*)." Accordingly Irenæus, reading the three-clause text, feels it as a freedom for the Gentiles, in contrast to the observance of the Law by the Jewish Christians.

Here, if anywhere, we should expect to find Irenæus explain the three-clause text as a moral code independent of any food-law, in case it were really so understood and interpreted in his Church. *As a matter of fact, however, we find*

in his Church the abstinence from blood as an established, absolutely undisputed custom, so that it was even used as a test for Christianity. In the Epistle, preserved by Eusebius, which the Churches of Vienna and Lugdunum sent to the brethren in Asia and Phrygia, we read that Biblias, having been prompted to relate impious crimes of the Christians, denied the calumnies and said: "How could those eat children *who are not even permitted to eat the blood of brute animals?*" I lay stress on the fact that the abstinence from blood is recorded here as a strict *prohibition*, which cannot be explained except by the authority of the Apostolic Decree, and I fail to see how this customary prohibition can be explained by the import of an eastern custom of which Clement of Alexandria is our first witness. On the other hand, the peaceful co-existence of the three-clause Decree and the established custom of abstinence from blood presupposes that *aîμα* in the Apostolic Decree, even though it is not accompanied by *πικτόν*, is undisputedly understood in its literal sense and not in the "spiritual" meaning as murder. It means also that Irenæus, explaining the Decree as he does in the quoted manner, did not at all feel the freedom of the Gentiles impaired by a regulation forbidding the Gentile Christians the eating of blood.

Here I wish to make two additional observations: In Lugdunum we get a hint which afterwards we shall find growing clearer. Biblias says: "How could people like these eat children, whilst they are not even permitted to eat the blood of brute animals?" This is the argument from the less to the greater, which in later explanations of the Decree plays such an important rôle, but the starting-point of the argument is the prohibition of blood as such.

A second observation is that in the whole exposition of the Apostolic Council by Irenæus the Holy Spirit takes a prominent place, and that for him the words *γεγόμενοι*

ἐν τῷ ἁγίῳ πνεύματι, which he read in his text, were not an otiose addition but an important feature of the discussions held at the Council.

The first who gives an interpretation of the clauses which lie in the direction of a "moral" code is Tertullian. But it is instructive to look closely at the words he actually uses. His tract *De Pudicitia* attacks the decree of the Roman bishop Maximus by which the carnal sins in general were declared remissible. Not until much later the traditional list of "peccata irremissibilia" as such was connected with the Apostolic Decree. Tertullian, however, quoting the Apostolic Decree in its Western Form in *De Pudicitia* c. xii. 4, adds: "It suffices that here for adultery and fornication is reserved its proper place of honour between idolatry and murder. For if blood (in general) is forbidden, we shall have to understand that much more human blood is forbidden (interdictum enim sanguinis multo magis humani intelligemus)."

At first sight it would seem that here at least we are justified in finding that the Apostolic Decree was understood in a moral sense; and that its three clauses were paralleled by the three peccata mortalia: idolatry, fornication and murder. Looking more closely, however, apparently just the reverse is the truth. The "multo magis humani" shows that Tertullian's opponents in Rome had *not* used the Decree as denoting three mortal sins, "blood" being understood as animal blood. It shows also that Tertullian concedes that the Decree by αἷμα does not simply denote murder. Tradition and practice, as he knows them, explain it as "blood." But from the recognised fact that animal blood is forbidden, he thinks to be justified in concluding that *much more* human blood is prohibited.

That this really is Tertullian's meaning is proved by *Apologeticus*, c. 9. Here Tertullian states that abstinence

from blood (as in Gallia according to the Epistle of the Churches of Vienna and Lugdunum) *and from things strangled* was established custom and obligation in the Churches of Africa. The whole ninth chapter is devoted to the discussion of the different forms in which blood is shed by the Gentiles, and to proving that to the conscience of Christians the eating of blood was connected with crime and murder. Then he proceeds to say that Christians are so far from any of these pagan crimes, that even animal blood is refused by them in their diet, and that they abstain even from the flesh of animals that have been strangled or that have died a natural death, in order not to be polluted by the blood "buried in the entrails." Leaving further particulars aside, I think this is proof sufficient that by Tertullian (who knows and quotes exclusively the three-clause text), the Apostolic Decree was not understood as a "moral" code. Only in a *derived* sense the "blood" of the Apostolic Decree may be regarded as applying even more particularly to human blood. But the original meaning which finds its application in the common practice of the Churches is that the Decree forbids the eating of blood, under which prohibition (whether expressly stated or not) there was included the blood of strangled animals.

As to Rome the "Octavius" (if we may believe the *mise-en-scène* of the dialogue and the witness of Lactantius and Jerome) attests the existence of the same custom there with a similar application of the ritual command to the prohibition of murder. "Nobis homicidium nec videre fas est nec audire, tantumque ab humano sanguine cavemus, ut nec edulium pecorum in cibis sanguinem noverimus." We may forgive the Apologist that he, in the interest of his argument, reverses the order as if the custom of not eating animal blood were based on the abhorrence of murder. The fact we want to state is only that in Rome, where the

three-clause Decree was received, the custom of not eating blood was established.

From all of which it follows with absolute stringency that in the whole Western Church, where the three-clause text was read, there is no trace that at the end of the second century the term "blood" was *not* understood as denoting animal blood, and it also follows that it is from the undisputed abstinence from blood that the apologetic a fortiori argument is derived (if animal blood is forbidden much more is human blood). Furthermore, there is nowhere any trace of evidence that the Decree was interpreted primarily as forbidding murder, and murder alone. And if this is true for Gallia, Africa and Rome, the letter from Vienna and Lugdunum to the Churches of Asia and Phrygia presupposes that the same custom and the same interpretation of the term in the Apostolic Decree was also received as a matter of course in Asia Minor.

It is absolutely necessary for a really exact and adequate understanding and interpretation of the Decree that these facts be kept in mind. They utterly destroy the theory that there was originally felt to be a difference in meaning between the three-clause text and the four-clause text. Whether *πικτόν* be added or not, *αἷμα* signifies nothing more than animal blood. And if the theory that *αἷμα* originally meant murder is to have any chance at all, the advocates of that theory have certain difficulties to surmount. They must first establish their case from the bare data of the Apostolic Council; then they must solve two problems: they must explain why the addition of *πικτόν* has almost as old a textual ancestry as its omission. And they must also explain why the whole Church, East and West, although it was always tending towards the "moral" interpretation of the three clauses, yet as a matter of practice took it as signifying abstinence from animal blood.

The interpretation as "blood" in the Western Church (with the three-clause text!) is so strong, that about two centuries later than the witnesses quoted, Ambrosiaster, one of the most intelligent commentators of the Western Church, in his commentary on Galatians ii. 1-2, knowing of the existence of manuscripts with the four-clause text, declares the addition of *suffocatum* an *adulteration* by the Greek sophists. Accordingly we should expect now the interpretation of *sanguis* as *homicidium*. On the contrary, he strongly opposes this exegesis, saying: "It simply forbids the eating of blood."

A still stronger proof may be added: Augustine in his *Speculum*, c. 29, though quoting the four-clause text, interprets it in a threefold sense, as forbidding that which was offered to the idols, blood and fornication. And then, much in the same way as Tertullian, he adds: "*unde nonnulli putant tria tantum crimina esse mortifera: idololatriam et homicidium et fornicationem.*" The "*unde*" proves that in the opinion of Augustine the latter interpretation is not the original one; but that it is only, as in the case of Tertullian, *derived* from it.

I think that the quoted facts show conclusively that the interpretation in its three-clause text as a moral code is simply a modern invention which finds no support in the early tradition of the text and in the corresponding customs of the early Church.

With this conclusion a great deal of the argument used either in favour of the Western Text or against it loses its value. There is no difference in meaning or purpose between the text including *πικτόν* and that omitting it. The crucial word *αἷμα* is not changed in meaning by the word *πικτόν*, which is only an exegetical addition, which is not at all felt as heterogeneous to the preceding *αἷμα*. On the contrary, in practice abstinence from blood and from

things strangled belong together in the Christian tradition. On this point early tradition is so perfectly unanimous that we must accept this interpretation of the Apostolic Decree as original, until absolutely stringent evidence is given to the contrary.

There is another point in the early practice of the Church which bears on the original interpretation of the Decree, or at least on its address. Before the time of Irenæus we do not find evidence for the abstinence from blood and things strangled in Christian Churches, even where we might expect to find it if it existed (Apoc. Joh. ii. 25 : Didache vi. 2 seq. ; Justin, *Dial.* xxxiv. 39). In the time of Justin the question of that which was offered to idols was settled : those who eat it are heretics (*Dial.* xxxv. 3 seq.). A short time afterwards the abstinence from blood and strangled animals was a general observance in the Christian Church. This proves that up to the time of Justin the Apostolic Decree was not accepted by the Churches in general. This may find its explanation in the address of the Decree, but even if it does, the question how it came to pass that the clauses of the Decree were only accepted gradually in the Church is a problem by itself.

We may now proceed carefully and cautiously to examine the textual evidence. Before, however, stating the actual data, we must emphasise one point : that a clear distinction must be made between the different occasions where the clauses occur. In Acts xv. 20 they represent a *proposal* on the part of James ; in the Apostolic Epistle they belong to an official report and advice accompanied by a brief résumé of the discussions which guided the Council in taking this resolution ; in Acts xxi. 25 they occur in a simple statement of an actual practice. This variety of occasion is not without influence on the variety of text.

Leaving on one side the slighter deviations, we may

say that the Decree viewed simply from the standpoint of text-criticism exists in two recensions, not in three, as Resch classified the texts : the third class of readings which Resch collects under the heading "Das Aposteldecret in einer Mischform als Speiseregul mit der Goldenen Sittenregel" is nothing else than a purely Western Text augmented by the Eastern *πικτόν*. As such this form is certainly secondary. The variations are not all equally well attested, still the evidence for the three-clause text-form belongs to one distinct family of textual tradition—that of D, Irenæus and their allies ; whilst the four-clause text is represented by the great Uncials and the bulk of MS. tradition. It will be now our task closely to examine the evidence of the textual tradition by itself, and to inquire after its verdict, independently of any historical theory about the possible origin of the variations.

There are three really important questions :

1. Does *πικτόν* belong to the original text of the Decree or not ?

2. Is the Golden Rule an essential part of the Western Text or is it there an interpolation ?

3. Is *φερόμενοι ἐν τῷ ἁγίῳ πνεύματι* an interpolation in the Western Text or not ?

Ad 1^{um}. The full apparatus may be found collected in Zahn, *Urausgabe*, 1916, S. 90–92 ; 154–156 for the early Latin translation ; S. 296–298 ; 358–365 for the Western Greek. From this apparatus it follows with complete certainty that the early Latin translation down to Jerome reads constantly only the three clauses : *idolothuta, sanguis, fornicatio*. Differences of order and translation (*idololatria, immolatis*) are irrelevant. Accordingly Zahn in his reconstruction of the Latin text omits "et suffocato(-is)." In the Greek, however, the supposed first edition by Luke, Zahn inserts καὶ πικτοῦ. We ask on what grounds ?

Our earliest Greek witness, Irenæus, omits *πνικτοῦ* both in xv. 20 and in xv. 29. So does D. The other Greek witnesses include it. We must, however, remark that a reading like that of Cyril of Jerusalem, *αἵματος πνικτοῦ* and "sanguine suffocato" in p* R and some MSS. of the Vulgate presupposes an earlier reading of *αἷμα* alone. And also that wherever the Golden Rule occurs in addition to a four-clause text, the probability exists that we have to do with a Western Text, into which the *πνικτοῦ* of the widely-spread Eastern form has been interpolated. We saw that, without a single exception, as far as we know, *αἷμα* was interpreted so as to include *πνικτόν*; hence the insertion of *πνικτόν* is more easily explained than its ejection. Seeing that the earliest witnesses of any text, Irenæus and the early Latin, read the three-clause form, I think we are not justified in regarding this text as spurious. I repeat that it does not make any difference so far as the original meaning of the Decree or its early interpretation is concerned; but if textual facts alone are to decide, I should say there is nothing to be done but accept the three-clause text as the original one and regard the *πνικτόν* as an addition made, in my opinion by Luke himself, or (if we must choose an alternative) made by an early copyist quite in accordance with the actual interpretation of *αἷμα* in the early Church.

Ad 2^{um}. With regard to the Golden Rule we must begin with a question of punctuation.

The text runs thus: *ἔδοξεν γὰρ τῷ ἁγίῳ πνεύματι καὶ ἡμῶν μὴδεν πλέον ἐπιτίθεσθαι ὑμῶν βάρους πλὴν τούτων τῶν ἐπάναγκες, κτέ.* Generally a colon is put after *ἐπάναγκες*. *Πλὴν* in this case is regarded as synonymous with *ἢ* or *χωρὶς* or *εἰ μὴ*. This interpretation is given already by the early Latin, but that is no guarantee at all that it is right. *Πλὴν* in this particular sense is very rare in the New Testament, but after *πλέον* it is quite impossible. And therefore

it must be read as the beginning of a new sentence, meaning "only," or "however."¹ The translation would then be: "We do not want to lay upon you any new burden; only, etc."

That this really is the meaning we may infer from the parallel words of James. The words: *μηδὲν πλέον ἐπιτίθεσθαι ὑμῖν βάρος* correspond to what James had said: *μὴ παρενοχλεῖν τοὺς ἀπὸ τῶν ἐθνῶν ἐπιστρέφουσιν ἐπὶ τὸν θεόν*, v. 19. Accordingly what follows cannot mean a *βάρος* for the Gentile Christians. And secondly, in Apoc. ii. 25, which apparently is a reminiscence of the Apostolic Decree, we read: *οὐ βάλλω ἐφ' ὑμᾶς ἄλλο βάρος· πλὴν ὃ ἔχετε κρατήσατε*. Here *πλὴν* is, exactly as in Acts xv. 29, the beginning of a new sentence.

But in this case *πλὴν* ought to be followed by an imperative. This is felt, for instance, by the Latin *c*, which reads "abstine-te," and by the Latin Irenæus who reads "ut abstineatis." Accordingly *ἀπεχέσθαι* must be explained as an infinitive pro imperativo: "Only, you should abstain from these things which are almost necessary" (*ἐπάναγκες* = *ferme necessaria*, Bengel). In the prefix *ἐπι* we may find expressed that though the principle of Christian freedom could not make the observance obligatory, the practice of life made this obligation almost unavoidable.

Now let us look closely at the forms in which the Golden Rule occurs in xv. 20 and xv. 29. The Greek D and 137 have it in xv. 29 in this form: *καὶ ὅσα μὴ θέλετε ἑαυτοῖς (αὐτοῖς 137) γείνεσθαι (γίνεσθαι 137) ἐτέρῳ μὴ ποιεῖν*. This is correct if the preceding infinitive is used for an imperative: "Only, you should abstain from things which are almost necessary: idol offerings, blood and fornication;

¹ For this point, as for some other exegetical questions in the Apostolic Decree, I may refer to the second part of Zahn's *Die Apostelgeschichte des Lucas*, Leipzig, 1921, the wonderful work of an octogenarian.

and, what you do not wish to be done to you, you should not do to any other." The infinitive *ποιεῖν* corresponds exactly to the preceding infinitive *ἀπέχεσθαι*.

So there is no objection to the Golden Rule here in xv. 29 on syntactical grounds. And if (as we must expect) the Apostolic Epistle gives a reflex of the deliberations of the Council, the Golden Rule is entirely to the point. It not only reminds the brethren of the general obligation of brotherly love, but it throws light on the sense in which the preceding advice of abstinence should be understood. It says that if the Gentile Christians were in the same circumstances as their brethren from the Jews, they could not wish to be constantly and publicly offended by practices which to the Jews seem *ἀλισγίμματα τῶν εἰδώλων* (the words are used by James but not repeated in the Epistle, where they might sound harsh in the ears of the Gentile Christians!) though to Gentiles these Jewish objections might seem futile.

James, however, in his address does not use this argument. He speaks from a Jewish point of view: "In every city of the great Empire" (James apparently is influenced by his Jewish surroundings; as a matter of fact circumstances were in the Empire a little different from those in Judaea!) "in every city of the Empire, Jews and proselytes every Sabbath are instructed in the Mosaic Law. They have a right to be respected in their feelings by the Gentile brethren with whom they converse." In his address, therefore, which was delivered from a Jewish point of view, the Golden Rule would have been meaningless.

What does now the textual evidence say?

In xv. 20 the Greek has the Golden Rule in D, and (possibly) in Irenæus. In the early Latin it occurs only in d and in the Latin Irenæus. Of the other translations it is read only in the Sahidic and the Aethiopic. The evidence

is much smaller than for xv. 29. But look now at the form in which it occurs in D, the *only* extant Greek witness. James is speaking in the third person: "Let us write them: to abstain from the pollutions of the idols, and of fornication and of blood, καὶ ὅσα μὴ θέλουσιν ἑαυτοῖς γένεσθαι, ἑτέροις μὴ ποιεῖτε. The Latin translation has the same mistake: *faciatis*. This *ποιεῖτε* is hopeless. The interpolator, transcribing the text from xv. 29, rightly changes the 2d person of *θέλετε* into the 3d: *θέλουσιν*, but in changing *ποιεῖν* was confused by the peculiar construction in xv. 29 and writes *ποιεῖτε*. The same incongruity is shown by d (*ne faciatis*) and by the Sahidic and Aethiopic translations. The Latin Irenæus correctly reads: *ne faciant*.

Concluding, we may say that if textual evidence is to decide, the Golden Rule, which already Aristides, xv. 5, seems to have read in this connexion, is genuine in the Apostolic Epistle xv. 29, but spurious in xv. 20.

Now, however, we are confronted by another difficulty. The traditional exegesis connects the following ἐξ ὧν with the preceding "forbidden things": "from which things if you abstain you shall do well." This translation is inspired by the "a quibus custodientes, etc." The verb διατηρεῖν, however, does *not* signify "to keep oneself free from." And even if it did, the preposition would not be ἐξ, but (as D has *Latinised* from d) ἀπό. The variety of the Latin translations already (*a quibus observantes; observando; conversantes vos ipsos*) shows that there was a difficulty felt. Διατηρεῖν without the reflexive pronoun occurs in Luc. ii. 51 in the sense of "hold fast, take care of." Τηρεῖν c. reflex. Jud. 21: ἑαυτοὺς ἐν τῇ ἀγαπῇ θεοῦ τηροῦσατε means "keep yourself continually in the love of God." Jac. i. 27, ἀσπιλὸν ἑαυτὸν τηρεῖν ἀπὸ τοῦ κόσμου "to keep oneself continually pure from the world." Moulton

and Milligan, *Vocabulary of the Greek New Testament*, pt. II. p. 155, quote Pap. Leid. U²¹, διατετήρηκα τὴν χώραν ἀμέμπτως. Διατηρεῖν expresses a continuity: "to guard continually undefiled" (cf. A. T. Robertson, *A Grammar of the Greek New Testament*, 3d ed., p. 828).

So διατηρεῖν ἐξ does not mean "abstain from" or "sich hüten vor" as Lietzmann translates in his Commentary i. 1. The only somewhat parallel place quoted by Lietzmann for this sense of διατηρεῖν is Psalm xi. 18: διατηρήσεις ἡμᾶς ἀπὸ (!) τῆς γενεᾶς ταύτης καὶ εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα. But here also the nuance of meaning with the preceding φυλάξεις is the continuity of being guarded by God.

So the sense of διατηροῦντες ἑαυτοὺς εἶτε πράξετε must be: "Continuing to behave as you did hitherto, you will act well." And ἐξ must be used here in the sense of "in accordance with (the preceding rules of behaviour)." Moulton and Milligan give in their *Vocabulary* (pt. III. p. 190) several instances of this use of ἐξ in Hellenistic Greek,¹ especially in legal expressions, and a kindred instance is found in Galatians iii. 2: "you have received the Holy Spirit ἐξ ἀκοῆς πίστεως" (in consequence of, etc.).

Translating now the text after the preceding rather minute investigations, it would run thus:

"For it seemed good to the Holy Spirit and to us to lay upon you no further burden; only, you should abstain from these almost necessary things: idol offerings and blood and fornication; and, what you do not wish to be done to you, you should not do to another. If you continue to behave in accordance with these preceding general rules you will act well!"

Gradually the Apostolic Epistle comes into a quite different light. It no longer gives a set of elementary legal commandments, but it suggests that the Gentile Christians should abstain from a few things which are practically better

¹ E.g. ἐκ ἰκρίσεως; κολλάζοντες τοῖς ἐκ τῶν νόμων ἐπιτίμοις; ἐκ τῆς ἀξίας (according to its value); etc.

avoided with a view to the scruples of the Jewish brethren and in accordance with the Golden Rule. In behaving so they will act well. I do not understand why Zahn so strongly objects to the translation of εὖ πράξετε as "you will act well." Generally, it is true, it signifies "you will fare well," and if with D we read it εὖ πράξατε as an aorist imperative, it might be translated so here. But I do not see why we should not translate it with Tertullian as "*recte agitis*," or with Robertson as "you will act well," in the same construction with a participle, as καλῶς ἐποίησας παραγενόμενος in Acts x. 33.

One might wonder that among the things which, with a view to the practice of life, are better avoided, appears fornication, which to our view is altogether incompatible with Christian morals. But the word has not a fixed meaning and may refer, as in the Old Testament, to participation in pagan cults, or to marriages in forbidden relationship. It seems to me that the first interpretation is the more probable in this context.

Ad 3^{um}. The third Western addition is *φρονοῦμεν ἐν τῷ ἁγίῳ πνεύματι*. It corresponds to the opening words of the Decree, *ἔδοξεν γὰρ τῷ ἁγίῳ πνεύματι*, and brings forward an outstanding feature of early Christian life. We remarked just now that in the exposition of the Epistle by Irenæus this feature has a very prominent place. The attestation of this addition is not so strong as for the other two readings we have discussed. It is read by D, d, Irenæus (Greek and Latin) and by Tertullian, i.e. by all our earliest witnesses for the Western Text. The objection is, however, easily explained by the (early) misunderstanding of the preceding εὖ πράξατε as the ordinary final greeting after which a reference to the guidance of the Spirit became meaningless. That is the reason why only the earliest witnesses could preserve it. So I do not hesitate to believe it genuine

in the first recension of Acts. We shall see that the guidance of the Spirit is Paul's chief argument in favour of the divine truth of his Gospel, when he defends it in Galatians, and it is only probable that here we have one instance of Paul's influence on the Council.

Summing up, I think we may say that there is no essential difference between the two recensions. The Western Text representing Luke's first edition, gives a more adequate idea of the principles by which the Council was led in taking its resolutions, whilst the Eastern Text reduced the Epistle to the practical rules of conduct. The addition of *πικτόν* does not alter the meaning of the Decree, it only explicitly says what also without that addition was understood, that not only blood separately but also blood in strangled animals should be avoided. The Council took decidedly the part of Paul in the conflict: only brotherly love, however, and the guidance of the Spirit should lead the Gentile brethren in avoiding offence to the Jewish brethren.

D. PLOOIJ.

THE PARADOX OF RELIGION.

A STUDY OF OTTO'S "THE HOLY."

THERE has been in this country no lack of interest in the "eschatological" reaction against the over-modernised conception of Jesus of much of the New Testament scholarship of the nineteenth century. Less noted, but no less noteworthy, has been the not dissimilar reaction in Germany against much of its Theology—a reaction which, in spite of the estrangement of the war, should not remain without influence here. We have, for instance, Professor Schæder, with his "Theocentric" Theology, and his emphasis on the

majesty of God, so that our faith is not only trust, it must be humility, it may be fear.¹ Or again, there is Professor Heim, the leader of so many of the younger men, with his endeavour to go beyond Kant, and his claim that in the prime fact of Christ is given, not only the answer to our moral need, but the solution of the last antinomies of thought.² Perhaps the most significant of all is Professor Rudolph Otto, whose book *The Holy* (*Das Heilige*), it is the purpose of this article to describe. Published first in 1916, Otto's book is already in the ninth edition. It has influenced opinion in the most unlikely quarters, and, if Theological Reviews are any indication, it is still the centre of interest in German Theology.

In this country Otto is probably best known through an early book of his, published in 1904, when he was still a *Privat-Dozent*, *Naturalistische und religiöse Weltansicht*, which was introduced by Professor Arthur Thomson to English readers, under the title *Naturalism and Religion*. Otto has published since translations of Sanskrit texts,³ for he approaches the problems of religion as one who is that rare combination, an oriental scholar who is also a Christian theologian. It is significant of much that he should now be Professor of Theology at Marburg in Herrmann's stead. Herrmann, even more definitely than Ritschl, refused to consider non-Christian religions. Otto, throughout, deals with Christianity in the wide context of religion, and doubtless owes to this much of the freshness and originality of his discussion.

In the limits of this article, we can only attempt to give an account—as far as possible in his own words—of that

¹ *Theocentrische Theologie*, I², 1916; II., 1914.

² His views find their clearest systematic expression in his *Glaubensgewissheit*, second edition, in 1920.

³ E.g., *Viṣṇu Nārāyaṇa* and *Siddhānta des Rāmāṇuja* in the *Religiöse Stimmen der Völker*, edited by Prof. W. Otto.

part of Otto's argument which deals more particularly with Christianity, and we will then venture briefly to indicate the contribution this book may make to our Christian thought and practice.

I.

The purpose of Otto's book is indicated by its sub-title, *On the Irrational in the Idea of the Divine and its Relation to the Rational*. Otto admits that every theistic interpretation of God must seek to define the Godhead by such predicates as Spirit, Reason, Will, Purpose, Benevolence, Omnipotence, Unity of Being, and Consciousness, and that these predicates are inevitably conceived through their analogy to the personal and the rational, as found imperfectly in man. Such predicates are clear and distinct concepts, within the reach of thought and definition. Without them, faith, as opposed to mere feeling, would be impossible. And the fulness and intelligibility of these concepts in Christianity is one proof of its superiority to other religions. But such rational predicates cannot adequately describe the Being of God. We are right to bring them into the foreground. But behind them is the irrational, an irrational which may be described, but can never be defined.

For the understanding of religion, and for the appreciation of its rational and irrational aspects, Otto claims that we need a distinctively religious category, the category of the Holy, a category which can no more be expressed in conceptual terms than can the category of the Beautiful. The holy, in his sense, is thus a purely religious conception. It includes the ethical, but it is more than the ethical. It has in it something which is distinctive, and peculiar to the sphere of religion, something which, as perfect of its kind, is a primary and elementary *datum*, and, as such, incapable of formal definition. For this, he coins the word, the

Numinosum, the Numinous.¹ It is to the description of this *numinosum* that he devotes the first part of his book.

Religious feelings embrace many elements which are not distinctively religious. Thus, as Christians, our religious feelings include gratitude, and trust, and love, and confidence ; but there are feelings peculiar to religion, and in these may be traced the reflex action of the Numinous.

The most elementary of these feelings is the feeling of "creaturehood." We may use Schleiermacher's happy phrase, and call this the feeling of "dependence," but we have to go farther than Schleiermacher. This is not a feeling of dependence in the "natural" sense of the word. It is a feeling distinctively religious ; it is the first reflex action of the Numinous.

This Numinous is, in all the diverse forms of religion, realised as the *mysterium tremendum*. The *tremendum* creates in us fear, not fear in the ordinary sense, but religious fear, for which our language, unlike the German, has, fortunately, a distinctive word, "awe." In lower forms of religion, this *tremendum* may take a demonic form. In India, the gods themselves have often their "angry" counterpart. But the *tremendum* is found also in the highest religions. In Christianity itself, we have it ; for what is the *ὄργη Θεοῦ* of the Bible but an expression of this *tremendum*, by the naïve analogy of human passion ? With this *tremendum* is combined the sense of God's absolute "unapproachableness." This *mysterium tremendum* is realised also as a "majesty" and "power" before which man feels himself to be as nothing. It is an energy, which at the lowest stages of religion may be thought of as demonic, but, at the highest, is expressed by such phrases as "the living God," or the "omnipotence of God." This numinous is not *tremendum* only ; it is *mysterium*. It is mysterious

¹ Derived from *numen* as ominous is derived from *omen*.

just because of its unlikeness to ourselves. Such words as the "emptiness" of Buddhist thinkers, and the "nothingness" of Christian mystics, are just numinous ideograms, expressive of the mystery of God, His unlikeness to ourselves.

The *numen* not only includes the elements of *tremendum* and *maiestas*. It has in it something peculiarly attractive and fascinating. It is the *numen fascinosum*. Throughout the whole sphere of religion, we can trace this double character, this harmony of contrasts, in the Numinous. We have it even in the lower phases of religion. Terrible and cruel as men have believed the Demonic-divine to be, they have been not only repelled, but attracted, fascinated. In connexion with this *fascinosum*, we have such rational concepts as love and pity, sympathy and willingness to help. But here, too, rational conceptions fail to provide an adequate description. There is the distinctively religious feeling of blessedness, which is something other than the natural sense of comfort and confidence, and the delight of being loved. This blessedness admits of no definition. We find it expressed sometimes in figurative speech as in the descriptions of the New Jerusalem; sometimes through negatives, which yet convey a quite positive meaning. "Eye hath not seen, nor ear heard, neither hath entered into the heart of man, the things which God hath prepared for them that love him." These words are negative in form, yet who can miss the positive rapture of their meaning? Whether it be the blessedness of heaven, or of the coming kingdom, the blessedness of longed-for, or attained, experience, blessedness is a distinctively religious feeling and as such incapable of precise expression. Like the feeling of awe, the feeling of blessedness is the reflex action on us of the Numinous.

Otto applies his teaching about the double nature of the Numinous to the problem of sin. Sin is numinous "un-

worth." Before the Numinous we say with Isaiah: "I am a man of unclean lips, and I dwell in the midst of a people of unclean lips." With Peter, we say: "Depart from me; for I am a sinful man, O Lord." Such words do not spring from a sense of conscious violation of the moral law. They are spontaneous utterances, expressing the immediate reflex action on the soul of the presence of the Numinous. Sin is "profanity." The sinner knows himself to be "profane," whilst God is holy. And so he is at once attracted and repelled by the Divine. He wishes to draw near to God, but he feels that he dare not approach the Holy, unless he can have a "covering," a "propitiation." And it is a mistake, says Otto, to suppose that this has become obsolete in Christianity. The God of the New Testament is not less holy than the God of the Old, and the difference between the creature and God is not less; it is absolute. True the New Testament has as its Gospel this: that God draws near to us. But this is not something obvious, as the "Dear God," people think. It is a tremendous paradox, an act of inconceivable grace, and to take away this paradox from Christianity is to superficialise it beyond recognition.

To this Otto returns later in his chapter on the Numinous in the New Testament. The movement, begun in the Old Testament, toward the ethicising and humanising of the idea of God, reached in the New Testament its goal in the proclamation of God as Father. And yet the Numinous was not excluded. The Gospel was primarily the Gospel of the Kingdom. As recent research has shown, the idea of the kingdom cannot be completely rationalised. It was a "heavenly" kingdom, which drew forth from men religious awe and had the attractiveness of mystery. And the "saints" of the New Testament are not the morally perfect. They are those who have entered into the mystery

of the last age, and so are no longer "profane," but a priestly people. The Lord of the Kingdom is the Heavenly Father. He is the Lord, holy, numinous, ἅγιος, *sacer* and *sanctus*, as is His Kingdom, and to an absolute degree. To overlook this is to make of the Gospel an idyll. It is pointless to argue that this was not part of Christ's formal teaching. For that there was no need. Every Jew knew that God was the Holy One of Israel. Christ's special work it was to reveal what was not thus recognised: that this Holy One was a heavenly Father. Yet Christ so taught God's Fatherhood as to emphasise its paradox. The first petition of the model prayer deals with the hallowing of God's name, and He bade men "fear Him, who is able to destroy both soul and body in hell." There was not lacking then in Christ's words, for all their graciousness, that note which sounds in the Epistle to the Hebrews: "It is a fearful thing to fall into the hands of the living God." "Our God is a consuming fire."¹ And in St. Paul, the ὁρμή θεοῦ is more than the reaction of righteousness. It bears the imprint of the *tremendum* of the Numinous. So, too, that experience of the love of God, which could lift his spirit up to the third heaven, was more than filial feeling. It was the *fascinatum*; the fascination of the Numinous. In a like fashion, we can enter into much in St. Paul's teaching which would otherwise be unintelligible. Thus his apparent denial of human freedom in his doctrine of predestination is really an expression of an unduly tense feeling of creaturehood, whilst his teaching about the σάαξ is due to his sense that man is not only weak; he is "profane," and, as such, incapable of drawing near to the Holy.

We come next to the inevitable reference to Luther. It is interesting to compare this chapter with the best known

¹ In the agony of Gethsemane itself, Otto sees the impress of the Numinous, but surely this is strained and artificial.

book of Otto's predecessor, *The Communion of the Christian with God*. In Herrmann's book, only those aspects of Luther's teaching are emphasised which deal with the gracious revelation of God in Jesus Christ. Otto speaks also of the other side of Luther's teaching, and claims that Luther's teaching about the hidden God, the *Deus absconditus*, is not a mere survival of Nominalistic speculation. It is an expression of that dark and mysterious background of Luther's piety which must not be ignored, if we would rightly understand his joyous trust in the grace of God.

So far Otto has been dealing with the Numinous, but he recognises to the full that this is only one element in the Divine. There is also the ethical. And in Christianity, more than in any other religion, the ethical is in the foreground. The Holy would not be the Holy of Christianity, did it not include those clear ethical elements, which it has been the special function of Protestantism to emphasise. As the Holy, the object of religion, is thus complex, our impression of it also is complex. The religious category of the holy is an *a priori* category, something given, not evolved, in which rational and irrational elements are necessarily combined. Without the irrational elements, religion degenerates into Rationalism, whilst only the presence of rational elements can save it from sinking into Fanaticism or Mysticism. The combination of the irrational and the rational in due harmony thus provides us with a standard of judgment, and, by this criterion, too, the superiority of Christianity to other religions could be demonstrated.

Otto then proceeds to discuss what he calls "divination," the power of recognising as genuine the Holy as manifested. "Divination," in his sense, is not unlike what in Christian Theology has been called the *testimonium spiritus*

sancti internum. This "divination" he illustrates from the New Testament. The disciples of Christ saw in Him, not only as Schleiermacher and some moderns have thought, the supreme subject of divination. He was to them its object also. Christ was to them the Holy in manifestation; in His life and mission they saw and felt the revealed presence of the Divine. This recognition was not primarily rational. It was not based on Christ's own claims, nor on their own surmises as to Christ's "inner consciousness." Their recognition was spontaneous, and unreasoned. In such words as these: "Jesus went before them; they were amazed, and as they followed they feared," we can see the impression of the Numinous that He made upon them. So, in Peter's confession, we have to do with a faith, based, not on argument, but on experience. It was a spontaneous utterance which surprised his Master, and drew from Him the words: "Flesh and blood hath not revealed it unto thee, but my Father which is in heaven."

What of ourselves? Must we base our Christian life upon the witness of the first believers, or is it possible for us too to use "divination"? Otto claims that we are not compelled to live upon the inheritance of the Apostolic Church. We may form a direct impression for ourselves, for we are equipped with the category of the holy, we have the witness of the Spirit. Complete knowledge is not required. Thus Paul the persecutor would have known little about Christianity. He would have heard fragments of information about the meaning of Christ, but even these would have been largely hostile caricatures. Yet, through the inner witness of the Spirit, he gained a deeper understanding of Christ than did any other of the early Church. If it were indeed true that the Christianity we know to-day had no relation to the religion of Jesus, then such an immediate impression would be for us impossible. But that is

not so. Christianity in its present form is a religion of redemption, claiming to bring salvation and deliverance. And, in spite of all variations and errors, it is a true development, not a "transmutation" nor an "epigenesis"; for the religion of Jesus was also a religion of redemption, a proclamation of the heavenly Kingdom and the forgiveness of sins. Although demonstrative proof is impossible, we too can be sure of the presence of the Divine. As we remember the preparation in Israel, the coming of Christ and all Christ's life and work, we too must judge: This is the Holy. If there be a God, and He wills to reveal Himself, such must He be. Thus we judge, and must judge, but not from logical compulsion, but as genuine "divination," as religious intuition. Rightly has the Cross been called the *speculum aeterni patris*, but it is also the *speculum* of the Holy. In the mingling of the revealed with the unrevealed, of supreme love with the *ὁραή* of the Numen, the Cross is the most living instance of the category of the Holy; it is the deepest religious intuition to be found in the history of religion.

If Christ be thus the object of "divination," where shall we place Him? This question Otto seeks to answer in his concluding chapter. Just as there are many who can appreciate music, but only a few who have creative power, so in religion, there are many who have receptive power, the inner witness of the Spirit, but, although they can receive, they cannot create. There is a higher stage, that of the prophet, in whom the power of "divination" has creative force. A higher stage still is conceivable, that of one who, possessing the Spirit in its fullness, is not only a prophet, a divinator, but himself in his person and work has become the object of the "divination" of the Holy. Such a one is more than a prophet, He is the Son.

II.

In Theology to be original is a doubtful advantage, and to complete originality Otto would make no claim. In his emphasis on the Holy as the characteristic element of religion, there is nothing distinctive. His view in this is shared by some of the most distinguished of recent students of religion.¹ What is distinctive is the thoroughness and freshness with which he applies this category to the problems of Theology. We may well agree with Karl Heim, himself one of the most original and independent of modern thinkers, that in this book, "the understanding of the peculiarity of Religion which we have been seeking for since Schleiermacher, has entered here into a new stadium."²

It has been impossible in the limits of this essay to refer to the illustrations of his theory which Otto gives from non-Christian religions, but much of the value of his book lies in its proof of the essential unity of religious feeling, and its indication of what that common religious feeling is. The comparative study of religion has often seemed less friend than foe to faith. Scholars tend inevitably to concentrate on religious terms and concepts, and so are often betrayed into an intellectualism which loses the sense of God in its narration of the thoughts of men. The interest is "anthropocentric"; the general is sought for, not the unique; there is a levelling down, a relativisation of all religions and the idea of evolution is often held to exclude the possibility of the final manifestation of the Divine.³ It is hard for many an academic scholar to believe that anything can

¹ Cf. Windelband's Essay on *Das Heilige*, first published in the second edition of his *Prolegomena* 1903, and Archbishop Söderblom's important book, *Das Werden des Gottesglaubens*, 1916

² *Otto's Kategorie des Heiligen*, Z.T.K., 1920, I.

³ For a criticism of the theology of the religio-historical school, I would venture to refer to my article *The Finality of the Christian Religion* in the *London Quarterly Review*, October, 1922.

be effective which is left undefined. Otto, through his emphasis on the distinctive element in religion, avoids this peril. Religion contains rational elements, but not in them alone lies its power. What man of any insight, for instance, would imagine that the awe and love of some of the worshippers of Krishna and Siva was inspired only by the rational concepts they have formed about these gods? Nor does the power of Christianity as a missionary religion depend alone on the clearness with which its rational and ethical elements are understood. If it did, much missionary preaching would be doomed in advance to utter failure. Many a devil-worshipper has, by a true "divination," found in Christ a power which could rescue him from fear and servitude long before he had any clear conception of the Gospel, or had made much response to its moral ideal. And in his intercourse with high-caste Hindus, the missionary will not, if he knows his task, think it enough to try to understand their theories and their customs that he may relate to these his Christian message. More than this is necessary. He has to try to understand the sense of the divine that philosophies and hymns reveal, for Christianity will not be accepted merely because its teaching is more consistent, or its morality higher, but only as men feel that in it they are in the presence of the supernatural and the eternal, that in Christ, God is not so much explained, as manifested.

Otto's book is capable of grave perversion. An exclusive emphasis on the Numinous might lead to mysticism, or even to theosophy, with its puerile quest of the occult. Otto, for the most part, guards against such perils, and writes as a Protestant who recognises the Protestant obligation of seeking to understand God's revelation and to present it in plain and simple speech. But we may not lose the sense of awe, the realisation of the august holiness of God. It is

a question of due proportion, of proper emphasis. Clear thought and correct practice are of great importance, but religion means more than these. Much of the malaise of Western Christianity is due to its self-centredness. We have to learn to treat God as an end, and not a means. If we thought more of God, and less of ourselves, or even of our race, we might be more effective, even in our service of men, for we should learn to present the Gospel with the note of authority, and in a tone of wonder.

It would be difficult to over-emphasise the influence of this book on the most recent German Theology. It must suffice to give one illustration. Ritschl, recognising that the Holy could not be identified with the ethical, omitted the Holy from his theology, and Julius Kaftan retains it only by making it synonymous with the completely ethical. In the latest Systematic Theology of the Ritschlian School, the suggestive *Glaubenslehre* of Horst Stephan,¹ Ritschl's attempt to exclude the Holy from Christian Theology is condemned, and the attributes of God are discussed under the two heads, God's Holiness and God's Nearness, and in this way the paradox of Christianity is made explicit.

The book may do for us the same service. If we preach only the attractiveness of God, God ceases to attract. If we speak of Him as a sort of Santa Claus whose one work it is to make men happy, we must not complain if adult minds cease to believe in His reality. Such was not Christ's preaching. To Him, God, not man, was in the centre of interest. As Titius pointed out long ago,² the Kingdom of God He proclaimed was not primarily the sphere in which men trusted God as Father and obeyed Him as King. It was rather the sphere in which God was manifested and in which He honours men by calling them His children. God

¹ Töpelmann, 1921.

² *Die Neutestamentliche Lehre von der Seligkeit*, I. p. 104, 1895.

was to Christ supremely the Father, but we miss the wonder of that message if we forget that this God whom Christ bade us call Father was the Numinous, the Holy, the august and majestic God of the Old Testament. There is a preaching of God's Fatherhood which is irreligious for it lacks the distinctively religious sense of awe. Our children call us father, but although they trust and love us, they know that we are faulty as they are. Between us and them there is no gulf. Between God and us is the immeasurable and awful difference of the holy and the "profane." To ignore this, is to ignore the clear teaching of the history of religion. As Otto's book shows, distinctively religious feeling finds in the Numinous, not the *fascinosum* alone, but the *mysterium tremendum*. The Gospel is adequate to the world's needs only as it is a paradox. It is futile to preach God's love as if it were obvious. It can be rightly preached only by those who are conscious of the majesty of God and awed by that grace which bids us call "our Father," Him who is the Holy.

SYDNEY CAVE.

THE CONCEPTION OF THE GOSPEL IN THE SYNOPTICS.

THE question that I want to raise in the present article is this—supposing that we only possessed the synoptic narrative of the life and teaching of Jesus and that all the rest of the New Testament had been lost in transmission, what conception should we be able to form of the Christian Gospel, that is, of the thing for which Jesus stood and which constituted His contribution to religion; or to put the question in other words, what was it that His earliest followers saw in Jesus that gave Him a unique and transcendent value for them and led them to regard Him as the centre of a new gospel for the world?

Now Jesus Himself never gave a definition of the term Gospel, and it is very questionable whether He ever used the word. The facts upon this point are interesting and may be summarised as follows :—

(1) The term gospel (*εὐαγγέλιον*) occurs twelve times in the Synoptics, eight times in Mark, four times in Matthew and not at all in Luke.

(2) Luke, on the other hand, uses the verb *εὐαγγελίζεσθαι* on eight occasions (once of John the Baptist), whereas it is only found elsewhere in the Synoptics in Matthew xi. 5 = Luke vii. 22.

(3) There are six occasions on which Mark puts the word "Gospel" into the lips of Jesus.

(a) Mark i. 5 : "Repent and believe the gospel."

(b) and (c) Mark viii. 35 and x. 29 : "For my sake and the gospel's."

(d) Mark xiii. 10 : "The gospel must first of all be preached to the Gentiles."

(e) Mark xiv. 9 : "Wherever the gospel is preached in the whole world."

(f) In the Appendix xvi. 15 : "Go into all the world and preach the gospel."

(4) In five cases out of the six there is a parallel to the Marcan passage in Matthew, who, in every case except one (since the passage in the Appendix need not be considered), deliberately omits the term. In the phrase "for my sake and the gospel's," which occurs twice in Mark, the reference to the gospel is omitted by both Matthew and Luke. The one instance in which Matthew and Mark agree in ascribing the use of the term "Gospel" to Jesus is in the verse, "Whosoever the gospel shall be preached throughout the world, that also which this woman has done shall be spoken of as a memorial to her." Here Matthew quotes the Marcan passage practically verbatim, and it looks as if the

words came from the evangelist rather than from Jesus Himself.

(5) There is one case where the use of the verb seems to be well authenticated, and that is in the reply of Jesus to John the Baptist, "The poor have the gospel preached to them," which is found both in Matthew and Luke, and therefore originates from Q. It is probable, however, that Jesus was not using the word here in any technical sense, but rather with the wide connotation which the term constantly bears in the latter part of the prophet Isaiah.

(6) But not only do the Synoptics differ in their ascription of the terms to Jesus, they differ still more in the interpretation which they put upon the word "Gospel." There can be no doubt with regard to Matthew's conception of the Gospel. On three out of the four occasions on which he uses the term, he describes the Gospel as the Gospel of the Kingdom. He even changes the phrase used by Mark in i. 14, "the gospel of God," into "the gospel of the kingdom." The Gospel to Matthew consisted in the proclamation of the speedy advent of the Kingdom of Heaven. Matthew's interpretation is supported by Luke, who on three occasions speaks of "preaching the gospel of the kingdom of God." It is probable (though demonstrative proof is lacking) that this conception of the Gospel is ultimately derived from Q. On the other hand, in Mark there is no reference at all to any relationship between the Gospel and the Kingdom. Wellhausen (who has the support of Harnack and Montefiore in this matter) is surely right when he says that the Gospel to Mark is "the Gospel of Jesus Christ," the Gospel of which Jesus Himself is the centre and the embodiment. Jesus Himself is the content of the Gospel. *He* is the good tidings; "For my sake" and "for the gospel's" are "close synonyms."

We are left therefore with the conclusion that the word

Gospel with any technical meaning was probably never used by Jesus at all and that the different interpretations given to the term in the Synoptics are the interpretations of the evangelists themselves.

But though Jesus never defines the Gospel, and though we cannot be certain that He ever used the term, we have abundant material in the Synoptics to enable us to answer the question—Why was it that the followers of Jesus in later times described His work and teaching as a Gospel ?

In gathering up this material, we must avoid as far as is possible the critical problems connected with the evidence. It will be impossible to reach any sure conclusion by discussing, at any rate at the commencement of our enquiry, the meaning involved in such technical theological expressions as “Messiah,” “the Son of Man,” “the Son of God,” because any result we may obtain from the terms themselves must rest merely upon a balance of critical probabilities, and can therefore never carry conviction or attain anything in the way of demonstrative proof. It seems to me that the only scientific method of procedure is to take the statements of Jesus Himself, as they are recorded in the Synoptics, with regard to the purpose and object of His ministry as the final data on which we can build up the evidence to enable us to reach a conclusion as to what His own interpretation of the gospel would have been if He had sought to define it.

I.

The earliest statement of all is found in Mark i. 38 : “Let us go into the neighbouring towns that I may preach there also—for to this end came I forth.” We need not stay to worry out the Christological implications involved in the last phrase of the sentence (ἐξῆλθον), because in the light of the Lukan variant (ἀπεστάλην) we cannot be sure of the

exact word which Jesus used. But we are entitled to say this at any rate—that Jesus from the first regarded His mission as Divine, and felt at the commencement of His ministry that preaching constituted its main function. The context of the passage shows that Jesus was conscious of the danger that He might be diverted from what He obviously regarded as the chief purpose of His mission. The work of healing threatened to absorb all His time and strength, and there was a risk that the primary object of His ministry might be eclipsed by the demand that was being made for the exercise of His miraculous powers. The conclusion is obvious—from the first days of His public ministry Jesus sought to make it plain that the supreme end of His ministry was spiritual, and that He had been sent to heal the souls of men rather than their bodies.

This first statement emphasises the prophetic side of the work of Christ. Whether at the moment of its utterance He perceived what the final goal of His life would be—whether He saw the end in the beginning, is a question upon which more than one view is possible; but space forbids the discussion of the problem here.

The theme which formed the burden of the preaching of Jesus at the outset is summed up in the words, "Repent, for the kingdom of heaven is at hand," and there can be little doubt that its essential features have been condensed in Matthew's version of the Sermon on the Mount. That Jesus considered His teaching (or rather the practice of it) to be an integral element in His Gospel is clear from His own utterances. He regards it as the rock or foundation on which the wise man will build his house. Any other foundation than "these sayings of mine" is but shifting sand and catastrophe awaits any structure that is erected upon it.

It is the fashion in modern times to belittle and minimise the original elements in the teaching of Jesus. Lake and

Foakes-Jackson, for instance, reduce them to a negligible quantity. That was not the impression, however, that His words produced on the minds of His first hearers. "What is this? A new teaching?" was the cry that rose spontaneously from the audience to which His first sermon was addressed in the synagogue at Capernaum. Jesus Himself felt that His message was out of tune with the current Judaism of His day. It was revolutionary. It was not a new patch that could be sewn on to an old garment. It was new wine which could not be put into the old wine-skins of Judaism. Between the new and the old there was a radical cleavage which finds expression in the well-known words, "Among those born of women there is none greater than John the Baptist, yet he that is least in the kingdom of heaven is greater than he." His Gospel is a "new covenant" which supplants the old.

Now the question as to the exact point or points, which constituted the original contribution of Jesus in His teaching, has been the subject of eternal debate and cannot be more than lightly touched upon in this discussion. If the impression we obtained from the Synoptics were that the ethical teaching of Jesus constituted the essence of His Gospel, and that there was little else that mattered, we should of course be compelled to concentrate upon this issue. But since, according to the synoptic picture of Jesus, the teaching by itself (isolated from all the rest of the work of Jesus) would not have constituted a gospel at all in any true sense of the term, and as it is certain that this was not the element to which the title "Gospel" was ever specially attached in the apostolic age, it would show a lack of the sense of proportion, if we were to attempt to do more than make a hasty summary of the conclusions which may be drawn.

First of all let us take the conception of God. Montefiore

and many others have affirmed in recent times that there is nothing specially new in the conception of God in the teaching of Jesus, and that all the elements which are found in it were anticipated in the prophetic or apocalyptic literature of the Jews. In a sense of course this is true. But we must remember that if we want to understand the vital beliefs of any religion, we must not fasten upon the ideas which occur in the literature only occasionally—the great prophetic utterances which at rare intervals transcend the common level of the faith ; we must take rather the ideas that are permanently present and found everywhere in the literature, for we may be sure that these are the elements which constitute the essence of the religion for the majority of its devotees. Now if we apply this canon to the case in point, we shall find that it will probably modify the charge that Jesus in His teaching simply reinforced an old conception of God. It is very largely of course a matter of emphasis. In contemporary Jewish literature the main emphasis is laid upon the majesty, the infinity, the holiness of God. The whole mediatorial system seems to suggest that if He is not the great Unknowable, He is at any rate the great Unapproachable. “ He is not a man as I am,” cries Job in his agony, “ that I should answer him, and there is no daysman between us that might lay his hand upon us both.” The faith of a people is often much better than its theological creed ; but there is certainly a sense of distance and remoteness in many of the current Jewish conceptions of God. Jesus at any rate changed the emphasis. He put all the stress on the Fatherhood rather than on the majesty of God, and upon His love rather than upon His holiness. It is not too much to say that Jesus humanised without anthropomorphising the idea of God. He at any rate thought that He had a new revelation of God to give to the world. “ No one knoweth the Father

save the Son and he to whomsoever the Son willeth to reveal Him."

We must pass over with the briefest possible mention the characteristic elements in the ethical and social ideals of Jesus. Reference must be made, however, to the Logion—which, though it is only found in Matthew, need not be questioned—in which Jesus defines His attitude to the law. "Think not that I have come to destroy the law and the prophets. I have come not to destroy but to fulfil" (*πληρῶσαι*), i.e. to carry to completion. The Jews regarded the law as the final and absolute embodiment of the will of God. Jesus definitely questions its finality, asserts that it is incomplete, and claims authority to supplement its enactments. This was a most audacious attitude for Jesus to take up. It was a challenge to the common and generally accepted belief that "the law of the Lord is perfect." The points upon which Jesus attempted to complete the law (and to complete it, it was sometimes necessary for Him to supersede the enactments of Moses) may be summed up under two heads: (1) He laid the utmost stress upon the inwardness of morality and upon the ethical value of motive and intention; (2) He insisted upon the universal application of the precepts of the law without any national or racial restrictions at all. Moreover He reduced the demands of the law (on its religious side as well as its ethical) to the exercise of a single principle—the principle of love—"Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and thy neighbour as thyself."

There was nothing particularly new in the conception of the Kingdom of Heaven, which was the phrase under which Jesus, like most of His contemporaries, portrayed His ideal of Utopia. It is sometimes asserted that Jesus transformed a political ideal of the kingdom into a spiritual. But that is not strictly true. In the highest phases of Jewish

apocalyptic the conception of the kingdom was not political in any real sense of the term: and there is not very much to differentiate it from the idea of the kingdom in the teaching of Jesus except in one point, and that is in the new ethical ideal which transformed the lives of its citizens and to that extent modified the character of the kingdom itself. The kingdom in the teaching of Jesus is not essentially different from "the kingdom of saints" in the Book of Daniel—the real difference lies in the different conceptions as to what constitutes a saint.

But we must hurry on from this scrappy and inadequate treatment of the teaching of Jesus to the second point of our argument.

II.

We may take as our second point the statement which Jesus made in answer to the enquiry of the disciples of John the Baptist—"The blind recover their sight, the lame walk, the lepers are cleansed, the deaf hear, the dead are raised up and the poor have the gospel preached to them." Now though the Gospel seems here to be distinguished from the miracles of Jesus, there can be little doubt that it was His healing ministry that led His contemporaries at first to see a Gospel in His life and work. The miracles were not merely unique acts of mercy and compassion, they had a religious significance for the people of His day which they scarcely possess for us. Disease was very largely explained as the result of demon-possession. Palestine in the time of Jesus thought in terms of demons where we think in terms of germs. The cure of disease meant the conquest of the demons who caused it, and that implied that a struggle had taken place in the spiritual realm and the victory had been won. By His frequent acts of exorcism Jesus struck a deadly blow at Satan and shattered his power. "How

can one enter into a strong man's house and spoil his goods unless he first bind the strong man ? " When the disciples returned from their first mission and brought the tidings of their triumph over the demons, Jesus greeted them with the words, " I was watching Satan fallen as lightning from heaven." A large element in the Gospel for Palestine, and indeed for the whole of the Christian Church in the first century, lay in the fact that Jesus had broken the power of Satan for ever and spoiled the principalities and powers which were responsible for most of the tragedy in human life. It is difficult for the Western mind to understand all that the message of emancipation from Satanic powers meant to the ancient world ; but to the low caste Hindhu to-day and to many a Chinaman this part of the synoptic narrative constitutes a veritable Gospel.

When we transfer the act of emancipation, as St. Paul did (for the demons were responsible for vice as well as disease) from the physical to the moral region, we reach what has always been regarded as the most important element in the Christian Gospel, i.e. the belief that Jesus has broken the power of sin and made the moral victory possible for all men. That this transference is not a modern refinement but represents an essential part of the work of Jesus can be proved from His own statements in the synoptic Gospels. There is a whole group of passages which bear upon the point. In the synagogue at Nazareth He took an excerpt from the latter part of Isaiah to describe the purpose of His ministry : " The Spirit of the Lord is upon me, because He anointed me to preach good tidings to the poor. He hath sent me to proclaim release to the captives, and recovery of sight to the blind, to set at liberty them that are bruised, to preach the acceptable year of the Lord." " The captives" and " the bruised " can only mean on the lips of Jesus the victims of the power of sin. Again, there is the familiar

Logion, "They that are whole have no need of a physician, but they that are sick. I am come to call not the righteous but sinners to repentance." Then there is the great decisive utterance which affirms that "the Son of Man is come to seek and to save that which is lost." It is this redemptive activity of Jesus that Montefiore regards as the most startling and original feature of His work. The ministry of Jesus "inaugurates a new idea—the idea of redemption—the idea of giving a fresh object of love and interest to the sinner and so freeing him from his sin." "The rescue and deliverance of the sinner through pity and love and personal service—the work and the method seem both alike due to the teacher of Nazareth." Now, if Montefiore is right in fixing upon this redemptive activity as the supreme contribution which Jesus made to religion, we shall be justified in saying that here we put our finger upon what is undoubtedly the outstanding feature in the New Testament conception of the Gospel. There are many elements in the synoptic conception of the character of the Gospel, but without the element of redemptive activity it is difficult to think that all the rest taken by themselves would constitute a gospel in any true sense of the word at all.

The whole narrative in the Synoptics presupposes that this redemptive activity is the main interest of Jesus. No teacher ever had a keener sense of the evil of sin than He, and yet no prophet ever had a surer conviction that the malady of sin was curable. From the very start of His public work, Jesus indicated in the strongest possible way that the main objective of His ministry was war against sin. There is no more dramatic incident in the Gospels than that challenging utterance of Jesus to the paralytic who had been let down through the roof in the house at Capernaum, "Thy sins are forgiven thee." It is not enough to say that Jesus was merely paying homage to the

common Jewish theory that there is a causal connexion between sin and disease. It is far more than that. The crowd in the house expected a miracle. They looked for the utterance of a word of healing. Pity and compassion demanded a response to the great act of faith which had surmounted the most serious obstacles in bringing the paralytic into the presence of Jesus. To the amazement of everybody, Jesus met the case by the apparently irrelevant declaration that the sick man's sins were pardoned. It was a swift dramatic stroke by which Jesus proclaimed to the world that His main mission was concerned not with the healing of the body but with the healing of the soul. There was a worse evil even than paralysis, and the helplessness which it induced, and that was sin, and it was for the destruction of sin that He had come into the world.

III.

But the war against sin was not limited to the redemptive value of the earthly ministry of Jesus. There are at any rate two passages in the Synoptics in which Jesus attributes redemptive value to His death. The first is the well-known Logion of Mark, which is also preserved in Matthew, "The Son of Man came not to be ministered unto, but to minister, and to give his life a ransom for many." It will not do for us to attempt to get a formal doctrine of the Atonement out of the word *λύτρον*. Far stronger terms are used by the author of the fourth book of Maccabees in describing the significance of the vicarious death of the martyrs in the great persecution of Antiochus Epiphanes: "They became as it were the antipoise (*ἀντιψόχον*) to the sin of the nation, and through the blood of these pious ones and their propitiatory (*ἱλαστικήον*) death, Divine Providence saved Israel." But though we cannot press the metaphor used by Jesus or extract from it a theory to explain the *rationale*

of the Atonement, we are at any rate justified in concluding that He attached vicarious significance to His death upon the Cross.

The second passage occurs in the institution of the Communion Service. Two versions of the Logion have come down to us and we cannot be sure which represents the original saying of Jesus. The saying as it is reported by Mark runs, "This cup is my blood of the covenant which is shed for many." These words need mean no more than "My blood is shed for many as the symbol of the new covenant" (as in Exodus xxiv. 8). They may, of course, have a larger significance, but as they stand, this is all the meaning we are entitled to extract from them. The Pauline version, on the other hand, "This is the new covenant through My blood," implies that the death of Christ was the instrument by which the new covenant was established. The probability is that the Markan form is earlier and that its meaning was intensified by St. Paul. At any rate, whichever version we adopt, it is noticeable that in this utterance Jesus blends Jeremiah's prophecy of the "new covenant" with an idea derived from the sacrificial system.

There is another verse, which is not usually quoted in this connexion, which seems to show that the Cross possessed a paramount significance for Jesus. It is the familiar saying which occurs twice in Matthew, twice in Luke, and once in Mark: "If any man would come after me, let him deny himself and take up his cross and follow me." This "doubly attested" saying, to use Burkitt's phrase (since it is found both in Mark and Q) contains the phrase, "Let him take up his cross," and suggests that the bearing of the Cross is the supreme demand made upon every disciple of Jesus. There is no evidence that the metaphor was in common use. It may have been derived, of course, from the common occurrence of the Roman crucifixions. But

whatever its origin, it looks as if it were, what may be called, the Cross-consciousness of Jesus breaking out spontaneously into ordinary speech, and it suggests that the Cross-consciousness of Jesus was much more vivid and permanent than the comparatively meagre references to it in the Synoptics seem to imply. This conclusion is borne out by the fact that the evangelists devote so much space to the narrative of the Crucifixion. Luke's Passion story begins at ix. 51 with the words, "He set His face to go up to Jerusalem." The emphasis upon the Crucifixion is not due to the fact that the historian took a morbid interest in the details of martyrdom. The murder of Stephen is told in a verse or two. The martyrdom of James is dismissed in a single phrase. The book of Acts comes to an end without the slightest reference to the death of Peter or Paul. It was not till well on in the second century that a morbid interest in martyrdom began to assert itself in the *Martyrium Polycarpi*. The writers of the apostolic age evidently felt that no other martyrdom could compare with the death of Jesus. There was something absolutely unique and incomparable about the Crucifixion.

But it may be objected that this emphasis is due to the reflex influence of the theology of St. Paul, under the spell of which both Mark and Luke seem to have fallen. But the remarkable fact is that so few traces of this influence are to be found in the synoptic Gospels themselves. It needs the use of a critical microscope to discover them at all. There is obviously no conscious attempt to import the doctrines of St. Paul into the teaching of Jesus. The restraint and reticence of the evangelists are far more noticeable than their subjection to the theological ideas of the Pauline age. If the writers of the Synoptics had been anxious to prove that the Pauline doctrine of the Atonement was an integral element in the teaching of Jesus, they would

not have been content with the insertion of a couple of phrases ; they would have been much more liberal in the additions which they made to the common tradition. It is very improbable, to say the least, that the evangelists have given a greater significance to the Cross in their narratives than it occupied in the consciousness of Jesus Himself. The proof of this rests not so much upon any spoken words attributed to Him by the Synoptists, but rather upon a psychological analysis of the motives which actuated and governed His whole life. The plan, upon which Jesus moulded His career, is inexplicable except on the assumption that the Cross was the climax and goal towards which the current of His life steadily moved. What is the meaning of the series of temptations which began in the wilderness and ended in the garden of Gethsemane ? The essence of these temptations lay in the choice which Jesus was compelled to make, not once but many times in the course of His public life, between the popular programme which would have placed Him upon the throne and afforded Him a magnificent opportunity of proving to the world what true religion, when it was linked with royal authority and state, could achieve ; and the other alternative--the *via dolorosa*--the way of poverty and suffering, the way that ended in the tragedy at Calvary. Why was it that Jesus consistently, though always with an effort, set aside the former course and deliberately chose the latter ? Is it so certain that martyrdom merely for martyrdom's sake is the surest method of propaganda ? Is it so self-evident that a brief life followed by a glorious death is more likely to secure a high moral advance for humanity than the teaching of a lifetime with a throne for its platform ? It is very difficult to give an adequate account of reason which led Jesus to choose the *via crucis*, unless the Cross constituted the supreme contribution which He had to make to the life of

the world ? The supremacy of the Cross seems to be only psychological explanation of the career of Jesus, especially during the final months of His public ministry. And if this be so, no interpretation of the Christian Gospel can be satisfactory which does not give the central place to the Cross.

IV.

There is a further point which ought to be mentioned, and that is the Apocalyptic promise in the teaching of Jesus. There can be no real doubt that Jesus convinced His followers that He would speedily return to the world as Conqueror and King. The apocalyptic element (in spite of the new attempt which has been made in the recently-published book, *The Lord of Truth*) cannot be eliminated from the Gospels without an act of critical violence. It is interesting to follow what may be called the curve of apocalyptic in the Gospels. The narrative begins with a blaze of apocalyptic in the teaching of John the Baptist. Before long, however, the ethical note begins to predominate, “*Repent, for the kingdom of heaven is at hand.*” The whole stress is laid on repentance, what it implies, what men must repent from, and what they must repent to—in other words, what is the content of the ethical ideal ? And it is not till after Caesarea Philippi that the apocalyptic note becomes dominant again in the Gospel narrative. The Parousia hope represents the climax of the teaching of Jesus. Now the significant fact for us is that Jesus put Himself in the centre of the Apocalyptic picture, and made Himself the hero of the drama. This is the most astounding thing in the Gospels. Jesus completely revolutionised Jewish apocalyptic, firstly by linking it inseparably with His death upon the Cross, and, secondly, by assuming for Himself the principal rôle in the drama. It is impossible

for us now to enter upon a discussion of the problems that are involved in the apocalyptic teaching of Jesus. Whatever else the Parousia promise may mean, it must at any rate mean this, that Jesus claims that His mission is not limited to His earthly ministry, but that He is Lord of the future ages, and from the throne of God in Heaven governs the destinies of the race and leads His people on to the ultimate goal—the establishment of the Kingdom of God. The Parousia hope was an essential element in the Gospel of the apostolic age, and in some form or other it is equally essential to our conception of the Gospel to-day, for without it we should have no sure guarantee, as far as Jesus is concerned, that history will not end in chaos and disaster.

Finally no treatment of the subject would be satisfactory which failed to make some allusion to the fact of the Resurrection. The fact of the Resurrection is only a kind of appendix in the synoptic narrative. Its full significance is necessarily unexplained. There is only one text which gives a hint of all that was involved in it for faith, and therefore for a true conception of the Gospel, and that is the saying preserved by Matthew, "Lo, I am with you always, even unto the end of the world." The very fact that the Resurrection only comes in the last chapters of the Synoptics and that its religious implications are undeveloped, is sufficient proof in itself that the Synoptics do not contain a full explication of the Gospel. The Resurrection is not a mere appendix to faith; it is one of the vital elements in a true conception of the Gospel. We have to wait for the theology of the apostolic age to find a true appreciation of its value and significance, and here we surely have a hint that Christian thought cannot rest permanently in the synoptic position. The Synoptics provide us with our data. They give us a picture of Jesus—teaching, preaching, working miracles, conquering the forces of evil, exercising a redemp-

tive ministry, promising to return in triumph, dying on the Cross as a ransom for many, that through His death a new covenant relationship may be established between God and man, and, finally, rising victoriously from the grave. And all these facts constitute the Gospel. Mark is quite right—the Gospel is Jesus Himself, and all that He was, and all that He did. But Christian thought is bound to face the intellectual problems which these facts raise. The theology of the apostolic age is an attempt to explain these facts in the light of Christian experience (and the new set of data which it provided), and in the terms of the thought of the first century. There seems at first sight to be a great gulf between the synoptic data and the Christological statements of Ephesians and Colossians, or the Prologue to the Fourth Gospel. Yet if our analysis of the synoptic data is sound, the facts could scarcely in the first century have issued in any other conclusions, and though the philosophical categories which we use may be different, an honest examination of the data can scarcely lead to lower results to-day.

HERBERT T. ANDREWS.

THE EPISTLE OF THE TORN HEART.

A NOTE ON 2 CORINTHIANS.

“PERSONAL passion,” says George Moore, “is the rarest of all literary gifts: antique literature shows no traces of it, and after the Epistle to the Romans we do not meet it till the twelfth century, when it flares up in the letters of Heloise.”

But before the Epistle to the Romans was sent forth, at least four of St. Paul's letters had been issued, striking a new note of passion: the passion of a new solicitude for men. Of these none shews so much intense feeling as the second

(it was probably the fourth) letter surviving from St. Paul's correspondence with the Corinthian Church.

The religious value of 2 Corinthians can be arrived at only when this thought is uppermost in our minds: that it is a passionate utterance of personal feeling, disturbed to the point of danger. It is the exposure of a heart torn by a tumult of conflicting emotions. It is a perpetual witness to the agonies of Christian love: a sample of the ferment made in human nature by the terrible impact of the Christ: a chapter from the inner history of the Suffering Servant of the Lord.

Yet it is the record of passion held in leash: and, as we read, our attention is apt to wander from Paul the agitated to the calm unseen Christ who mastered him, and who held him with a grasp that was relentless in the firmness of its love, and guided him through dangerous storm to a haven of peace.

I.

As one reads the utterances of this passionate pilgrim of a love learned from Christ, one is impressed by the translucent *sincerity* of the servant of the Lord.

Paul's protestations of an inexpugnable core of sincerity and integrity at the quick of his self-estimate have never, so far as I know, been adequately studied and explained. They were there, at the heart of his most willing and naïve confession of sin. If he ever really called himself "the chief of sinners," he even more certainly protested his joy in his own sincerity—the word he uses means transparency—a sincerity which he appears to compare with God's or to trace to God. He connects it with the character of the religion he professed and of the ministry within that religion which he exercised.

For what is Christianity but God seen through the transparency of Jesus? And what is one's ministry but reflect-

ing, mediating the Christ ? A religion and a ministry like this must open out translucently both toward man and toward God. "Who is qualified for this career ?" he cries : and adds, quietly : "I am ; for I am not, like most, adulterating the word of God ; like a man of sincerity, like a man of God, I speak the word in Christ before the very presence of God."

So stood this servant of the Lord, "mirroring the glory of the Lord with unveiled face," standing face to face with God in Christ, judged by the sunlight of His presence, and saved from instability of purpose by his very association with the God of the everlasting Yes, the God of earnest purpose and faithful affirmations and designs of love transparently sincere.

II.

One is impressed, too, in this letter by the emphasis on *Suffering*. Written while the heart of the writer is still shivering after an experience so terrifying that to every aching question there seemed but one reply, the dread word Death,—the letter has become the great classic of the Christian philosophy of suffering.

For strange as it may seem to us, the writer feels he has to explain if not to justify suffering. He is writing to people who associated religion with prosperity and whose priests were unblemished. And as his turbulent writing rushes on, he thrusts forth great thoughts on the meaning of suffering—stressing such ideas as its vicarious design, the peculiar quality of the faith evoked *in extremis*, its contribution to the demonstration of spiritual forces and the vindication of spiritual hopes,—so that Suffering is seen to be the Servant of the Servant of the Lord,—the minister of his usefulness, the evidence of his vocation, the harbinger of his holiest hopes.

III.

And, in particular, there is one kind of suffering of which this Epistle is full : the agony of love rejected and despised. Paul had spent himself upon these Corinthian people : he had to experience the flouting of the very love in which he had cast himself upon them.

His reaction to this experience is curiously complex : I suppose because of the conflict between two tendencies whose co-existence makes one of the great paradoxes of the Christian consciousness : the tendency, on the one hand, to self-obliteration in ministrant service, and upon the other to self-realisation. Paul resents the treatment he has received and anon asks forgiveness for his resentment : he lets indignation and even scorn roll up upon his spirit, then rises and rebukes the wind and the sea : he would be stern, but hesitates ; he is " weak in Christ." And the heart that thus vacillated because it loved so ardently lies, as on a dissecting table, quivering still for all the world to see. Is there writing anywhere like this ?

IV.

As we near the end of the letter, the heaving seas begin to cease their troubling, and the anchorage of a holy peace draws nigh. In a momentary severity, it is true, the last swell of the dying storm rolls in upon us : but the wave recedes. Even out of the idea of Love that sternness passes, which makes the turbid prose of 2 Corinthians a corrective of the lyric placidity of the Hymn to Love in 1 Corinthians, and we hear nothing but the gentle lapping of wavelets in the harbour as the Apostolic Blessing is uttered—against what a stormy background !—" The grace of the Lord Jesus Christ, and the love of God and the communion of the Holy Ghost be with you all." Even over quivering self-consciousness Love has triumphed : the tempest-tossed spirit knows itself enswathed in the Divine kindness, and is still.

G. A. JOHNSTON ROSS.

JESUS SEEKING THE LOST.

Matthew Speaks.

From the toll-bench where I sat every day
I watched Him preach beside the Lake, that lay
Quiet and cool, close to the great high-way.

Huge crowds listened. And, times, this hungry soul
Would steal quick across from the place of toll ;
Brief time I tarried,—ah, but rich the dole !

Then I began to jot down what I heard
Upon this scroll, brother ; so much I feared
Memory might mislay one magical word.

And once, just after He had preached in church,
I touched His arm as He passed down the porch ;
He smiled and did not wipe away the smirch.

There began my worship. And when next day
We found Him in the hills, and He said Nay
To all our pleading, sad I came away.

So to my toll-bench I returned to wait
Jesus' returning there, or soon or late,—
A poor worm, till I saw Him pass the gate.

Yes, Simon, well I mind that eve you came ;
The sun just set, earth and sky still aflame ;
As you passed by He smiled and spoke my name.

He did not bid me follow Him just then ;
Yet I could not let Him vanish again,
So I closed the gate, took my scroll and pen,

Kept you in sight for hours, till you were come
Circled by welcoming cries to Simon's home.
Boldly I followed you within the room.

Swiftly the news spreads through the town, " He's home ! "
And swift from mansion and from cot they come,
Till even the courtyard fails to give them room.

Rapt stood we when the silver voice began
Telling of God His heavenly Father's plan
To bring His pardoning grace to sinful man.

Even as He spoke, the roof gaped overhead ;
Down slid Manasseh slowly, on his bed
Slung by the corners,—shrinking, almost dead.

His friends leaned over from the broken roof,
And begged Jesus to heal, on his behalf
Who bore in palsied limbs sin's dreadful proof.

Ah, though my flesh gave no betraying sign,
Lay there 'twixt guilt and guilt a boundary line ?
We were old friends, and all his sins were mine.

The crowded room, the hustling to and fro
Swooned out of time and space, and Love bent low
From heaven, and Love to heaven from earth did go.

Through my dimmed eyes I saw Manasseh's tears ;
We knew Love looked upon our wasted years,
And shared the shame of our ill-spent careers.

Through my dimmed eyes I saw the Master's face
All courteous pity and courageous grace ;
Love poured from that clear look on us apace :

“ You have hurt God, but dry your tears,
Lad ; I forgive those finished years.
Begin again ; there's no arrears ! ”

O dreamer, waken ! From what realms unknown
Is that strange utterance to us-ward blown ?
Who can forgive our sins, save God alone ?

Have we sinned toward Thee, Thou joyful Youth ?
We have hurt God : have we hurt Thee forsooth ? . . .
Yet—*our* hearts witness,—Thou dost speak the Truth.

Thou, Thou alone hast dwelled within God's heart,
And sinless borne with Him a son's full part
In all His shame, in all His bitter smart ;

Swift flashed the thought, and my feet were unshod.
So, having suffered sin along with God,
Along with Him Thou may'st withhold the rod ! . . .

And yet I felt in Him no soaring mood :
He seemed to give that grace, like daily food,
Passed on from Hand to hand, as brothers should.

And if He sat nearest His Father's place,
 And gave, straight from God's hand, this gift of grace,
 There was no pride written upon His face.

Only He sadly turned and said
 To those grim scribes beside the bed :
 "Your dark hearts whisper 'Blasphemy,
 Affronting thus God's majesty !'
 Whether is easier to say
 All your guilt is put away,
 Or make him stand upon his feet ?—
 Well, if you think I am a cheat,—
 Rise, and go home now, son, and mind,
 You must not leave your bed behind !
 Behold the Son of man hath power
 To pardon sin on earth this hour."

Then they all marvelled, but Manasseh said
 Softly to me, as he took up his bed,
 "The last was easier : flesh lived, soul was dead."

Next day, as Jesus passed out toward the sea,
 He paused beside my desk expectantly ;
 His face was bright ; He whispered, "Follow me !"

And so my life began. Sweethearts at play
 Ask, "What did we to pass the time away
 Before we loved ? We were not born," they say.

Thus on that day I bade my waking soul
 Good-morrow, and I left the place of toll,
 And rose, and followed Him who makes me whole.

* * * * *

I planned a feast of welcome and farewell
 Where I might gather all my friends, and tell
 My good news, and rejoice with them a spell,

And welcome Jesus in the open day ;
 Some even might follow with me in His way ;
 When they heard Him, how could they say Him Nay ?

To this great feast all my old comrades came,—
 Excisemen, soldiers, women of ill-fame,
 Creatures of small repute, souls blind, halt, lame.

But as we sat beneath my lemon trees
 Feasting with Jesus, happy as you please,
 There stalked in five important Pharisees,

And said to Simon here, "What does this mean?
Your Master dines with folk that are unclean;
In such a place no good man should be seen."

Simon was angry and grew red,
But Jesus turned to them, and said:
"Those who are well and strong, like you,
Don't need a doctor; sick men do.
I did not come to call just men,
But sinners to return again
To God. If you were as happy to-day
As we are, you would not say
It is strange to feast and rejoice this way.
Take heed that you do not despise
These little ones; their angels' eyes,
I tell you, look upon God's face
Always within His secret place;
Yea, the Son of man is come
To lead these little lost ones home.

I knew a shepherd near Sepphoris
Had a hundred sheep of his own, no less;
I met him one day when I was a boy,
He was empty of meat but full of joy,
For he had found the sheep that had strayed
Over the rocks by herself; and he said
He had searched in the mist, a night and a day,
For this one poor sheep that had gone astray.
I was a little lad, but remember
Well what he said, as I watched him clamber
Over the rocks, with the sheep on his shoulder,
Sure as a wild goat from boulder to boulder,—
'The Lord is your Shepherd, Jesus, and mind you,
If you ever get lost He won't rest till He find you!'

And always since then, when things get strayed,
When even a shilling is mislaid,
And folk begin to search and sweep,
I see that shepherd with his sheep:
I see him call the neighbours in
Round his hearth-fire, and begin
To rejoice with them, and they with their host,
Because he had found the sheep that was lost.
I hear my mother's happy voice
When she found her lost coin: 'Rejoice,'
She cried to all the neighbours round,
'The shilling which I lost is found!'

Is not a sheep worth more than a shilling ?
 A soul worth far more than a sheep ?
 And God your Father far more willing
 Than even that shepherd was, to keep
 His flock entire ? His *flock* ? Say rather
 His own children !

There was a father
 Had two sons. 'Father, give to me,'
 Said the younger, 'my share of the property.'
 So his father gave him his portion, and he
 In a fortnight was off to a far country,
 Where he squandered his money in riotous ways ;
 And when all was spent, there came lean days
 Upon that land, and he began
 To want ; and he hired himself to a man,
 Who forthwith sent him—to herd swine.
 And while he was there, he was fain to dine
 On the carob pods that fed the pigs,
 And no one cared a couple of figs.
 And when he came to himself, he said,
 'My father's men have all got bread
 Enough and to spare, and here I lie
 Perishing in penury !
 I will arise and go to my father,
 And will say to him, Father, father,
 I have sinned against heaven, and before thee ;
 And am no more worthy to be
 Called thy son ; appoint me then
 A place as one of thy hired men.
 So he set out for home that day ;
 But, while yet he was far away,
 His father saw him coming, and went
 Forth like the wind to meet him, and leant
 On his neck, and kissed him. 'Father,' said he,
 'I have sinned against heaven and before thee,
 And am no more worthy,—' but that was all ;
 For now the old man began to call
 To his on-looking servants : 'Bring shoes for his feet,
 The best coat, a ring, and something to eat ;
 Kill the fatted calf, and spread
 A feast, for this my son was dead
 And is alive again,—was lost
 And now is found.'—

But there was an elder son out fencing
 A field, when his brother returned, and that night,

When he came back, the house was alight
 And filled with the sound of music and dancing.
 'What is the meaning of this?' he cried
 To one of the servants; who replied,
 'Your brother is home, and your father's so glad,
 He's killed yon fatted calf we had.'
 This angered the elder brother, and he
 Refused to join the company.
 Then his father tried to win him to reason;
 But he said, 'In and out of season
 I have served you faithfully,
 Yet you never gave even a kid to me,
 All these years, that I might feast
 With my friends. But now this beast
 Of a son of yours comes back, you've gone
 And killed the fatted calf!'

'My son,'

Said the father, 'you and I
 Have always been together; why,
 All that I have is yours; and how
 Could we but feast and make merry now?
 For here is your brother home safe and sound;
 He was dead, and is living, was lost, and is found.'"

EDITH ANNE ROBERTSON,

J. A. ROBERTSON.

THE FEEDING OF THE FOUR THOUSAND AND OUR LORD'S MINISTRY TO THE GENTILES.

I PROPOSE in the following pages to review the question whether the Feeding of the Four Thousand is to be regarded as a separate miracle or merely as a "doublet" of the Feeding of the Five Thousand, and to connect the investigation with the wider problem of our Lord's attitude to Gentiles. Some of the points which will come under discussion are familiar to Bible students, but I shall concern myself chiefly with some that seem to have been overlooked or inadequately appreciated.

The second narrative is not in any case unimportant. Even on the "doublet" theory, as Dr. Sanday has pointed

out (Hastings' *D. B.*, Art. "Jesus Christ") we have powerful corroborative evidence of the substantial historicity of the Feeding of the Five Thousand. The common source—if such there be—of the two stories must lie chronologically far behind the Second Gospel. But we must not overlook the fact that this Gospel, like the First, not merely gives the two narratives separately, but sharply differentiates them in the following section. The words there attributed to our Lord pointedly call attention to the fact that the miracle was performed twice, and explicitly recall some of the distinctive features of each of the two incidents. This fact surely makes it impossible to suppose that the Evangelist had simply met with two forms of the same story and been deceived into regarding them as two distinct narratives; the *repetition* of the miracle (note especially the *ὁἶπω* in Mark viii. 21), is one of the salient points of our Lord's rebuke. If this utterance of Christ is not to be set aside as a deliberate fiction of the Evangelist, it is surely authentic; and critics who take an intermediate view and regard the passage as honest but untrustworthy tradition ought to realise that on their own theory the separateness of the two incidents was even at that early date not only indicated but emphasised; in fact, it would almost seem, on this theory, as though the Evangelist, or his authority, had heard the "doublet" theory and was taking pains to refute it.

We may remark in passing that this rebuke of the disciples by our Lord contains at least one natural touch which is not very likely to have occurred to an inventor,—“Perceive ye not yet?”¹ And this point leads on to another. The continued unbelief of the Twelve (indicated both here and

¹ Was it partly as an object-lesson to the Twelve, whose spiritual blindness two miracles had failed to remove, that the Lord afterwards performed *two* healing acts upon the blind man near Bethsaida?

in v. 4), which has been pronounced "psychologically impossible," (Gould's verdict on v. 4 in the *International Critical Commentary*.)¹ is surely a note of historicity. Its superficial improbability would have struck an inventor as it has struck the modern commentator, but it is true to nature, and is abundantly confirmed by Christian experience. He who has been delivered in six troubles is not always trustful about the seventh; even the saints of the New Covenant are apt to say in their hearts, "Behold, he smote the rock, that the waters gushed out . . . can he give bread also?" This mood can be illustrated even from the life of George Müller.

Who the authority was on whom the Evangelist depended is of course a question of great importance. It is necessary to say a word here on this point, because the external evidence for the second miracle is apt to be ignored or belittled even by scholars who are not disposed to accept the "doublet" theory. It is obvious that the question cannot be adequately discussed unless we make up our minds how much weight we are going to allow to the authority of the Evangelists and in particular of the Second Evangelist. If the Second Gospel is from the hand of Mark, and if, as internal and external considerations both indicate, Mark was the *ἐρμηνευτής Πέτροῦ*, the "doublet" theory is at once blocked by a formidable obstacle. An eye-witness could not possibly have erred on such a point. And, as I have already tried to show, the hypothesis that Mark simply jumbled together two narratives which he had heard at different times is excluded by the language of vii. 17-21, to say nothing of the variations of detail in the narratives themselves.

It is difficult, again, not to feel that here, as elsewhere, the authority of the First Gospel is too lightly set aside. It is

¹ Swete justly criticises this remark; v. his commentary *in loc.*

easy to exaggerate the dependence—if dependence is the right word—of the First Evangelist upon the Second. The mere borrowing of Mark's phraseology is no conclusive proof of such dependence, and his frequent variations in detail—unless these are to be dismissed as mere wanton tampering with his authority—seem to indicate that he had independent means of knowing the facts, and did not consider himself bound to follow slavishly in the footsteps of Mark. In this particular narrative, for instance, he inserts more than one detail (xv. 29–31 and 38) which is not to be found in the Second Gospel; and it is most important to notice that the section xv. 5–12 is quite independent of the corresponding section in Mark.

We come now to an examination of the narratives themselves. And first, let us take the question of the crowds. The difference of the numbers is not unimportant, but it is not the only difference. There is a significant hint in Matthew that the Four Thousand were at least mainly Gentiles. The phrase "they glorified the God of Israel," does not seem at all appropriate in reference to Jews, but is perfectly natural in describing the attitude of Gentiles.¹ And the topographical data may perhaps be alleged as pointing the same way. If Mark vii. 31–37 and viii. 1–9 are to be read continuously—and Matthew's independent section, xv. 30, 31, suggests that they are—we must suppose that the scene of the miracle was Decapolis, where the population would probably be predominantly Gentile.

It may be remarked that the hypothesis of a Gentile crowd removes a difficulty which might otherwise be felt as to the repetition of the miracle. After the disastrous sequel recorded by St. John (vi. 15), and hinted at by Matthew and Mark, we should hardly expect that Jesus would have risked another outbreak of the carnal Messianic enthusiasm

¹ Bishop Drury's *Ministry of our Lord*, pp. 58–61.

which He had already taken such pains to repress and avoid. It would seem, in fact, that that outbreak brought to a close the Lord's ministry in Galilee. It has been remarked that His treatment of the blind man near Bethsaïda is in striking accord with the woe previously denounced on that guilty and impenitent city.¹ Judgement had already gone forth, and no more signs were to be granted. The Lord is willing to heal the man, but not in Bethsaïda.² Nor are the inhabitants even to hear of the miracle. An injunction of silence is now not sufficient; the man is not only led out of the city, but forbidden to return, a mode of procedure unexampled in our Lord's ministry. It does not then seem likely that He would have repeated the miracle of feeding for the benefit of a Galilæan crowd.

But is there no difficulty involved in the alternative theory—the theory of a Gentile crowd? If Jesus was a “minister of the circumcision,” as St. Paul says, if, as He said Himself, He was “not sent but unto the lost sheep of the house of Israel,” can we readily believe that He performed a miracle, and that upon so large a scale, for the benefit of those who in general were outside the scope of His earthly ministry? And is not the difficulty of this theory increased by the fact that He had been healing their sick for three days previously to the miracle of feeding?

I do not think it is generally realised how interesting and at the same time how difficult a question is the attitude of our Lord to Gentiles during His earthly life. As this question is raised by the theory that the Four Thousand were Gentiles, it is necessary to deal with it here.

It is quite clear, at the outset, that our Lord did not

¹ This chronology seems to be correct, but we cannot of course be quite certain about it.

² It should also be noted that the man was presumably not a native of Bethsaïda. Our Lord would surely not have forbidden him to go to his own home.

absolutely refuse all miraculous benefits to those who were not of Israelitish birth. It would also seem quite evident—though it has been disputed—that He regarded the Gentiles as destined ultimately to be received into the Kingdom of God, and even—partially and for a time—to possess it to the exclusion of Israel.¹ But He does not seem ever to have worked a miracle for the benefit of a Gentile without a special reason.

The case of the centurion's servant stands, in some degree, by itself. The centurion, though a Gentile, does not seem to have been a heathen; he was apparently a worshipper of the true God, and St. Luke tells us that he enlisted the intercession of the elders of the Jews. Yet even here the Lord calls special attention to the contrast between the faith of a Gentile and the unbelief of Israel, and points forward to a time when Gentiles shall sit down in the kingdom of heaven, while the children of the kingdom are excluded. If this was the first miracle, as it seems to have been, which Jesus performed for a Gentile, we may perhaps say that it gives us the key to His attitude to Gentiles during His ministry. In general, as He Himself said, He was sent only to the lost sheep of the house of Israel, but He not only pointed forward to a time when this would no longer be the case, He broke through the restriction from time to time as circumstances arose which indicated His Heavenly Father's will. The Lord Jesus in His earthly life was guided by the Holy Spirit, who probably revealed to Him through circumstances—we shall find a striking instance of this presently in the case of the Syrophenician woman—the steps which He must take in this matter.

For it must not be forgotten that the temporary and

¹ "Many shall come from the east and the west . . .," Matt. viii 11.

"The kingdom of God shall be taken from you, and given to a nation bringing forth the fruits thereof," Matt. xxi. 43.

dispensational regulation which excluded the Gentile was what Bishop Butler calls a "positive," not a "moral" law; although of divine origin, it was liable, like the law of the shewbread, to be superseded from time to time by higher considerations.

Now we have seen that, in the case of the centurion, our Lord contrasted the faith of the Gentile, a strong and remarkable faith—Jesus marvelled at it, as He exclaimed at the faith of the Syrophenician woman—with Israel's unbelief. And I think we shall find the occasional ministrations of our Lord to the Gentiles determined by one or other or both of these two factors, special faith on the part of a Gentile, and rejection on the part of Israel.

We pass accordingly to the second instance, given us in Mark iii. 6-12, with its very instructive parallel in Matt. xii. 14-21. This is the first of the two occasions—prior to His final departure from Galilee—on which the Lord is said to have left the Holy Land and retired to Gentile territory. On each of these occasions His object seems to have been the avoiding of strife with the religious leaders of Israel.¹ And on each occasion the Gentile was allowed to profit by the perverseness of the Jew. Just as St. Paul, in later years, turned to the Gentiles when the Gospel was rejected by the Jews, so did the Lord Himself, though only for short seasons, turn from unbelieving Israel and allow the light of His countenance to shine upon the nations beyond her border. Mark alone mentions explicitly the presence of Gentiles in the crowd, and that only incidentally,—“and they about Tyre and Sidon,” iii. 8,—but Matthew calls special attention to the fact. Here the multitude was partly Jewish and partly Gentile, so that the benefits bestowed on the latter

¹ I am indebted for this point, if my memory serves me rightly after some years, to Zahn's commentary on St. Matthew, ch. xii., and especially, I think, to his remarks on the quotation from Isaiah.

were not so marked and pointed as in the cases of the centurion and the Syrophenician woman : it was perhaps only the subsequent reflection of the Evangelist that discovered their significance.

The significance was more obvious on the second occasion. Once again there had been controversy between Jesus and the religious leaders of Israel, and once again the Lord had departed from the Holy Land and gone into heathen territory. On this occasion He Himself raises the question of Jew and Gentile. The Gospel narrative seems to make it quite clear that He did not at first intend to grant the woman's request. It has become a commonplace of interpretation that His refusal was intended to test her faith. This may be true. But the words about "the lost sheep of the house of Israel" were not spoken to the woman—nor apparently (*v.* Matt. xv. 25, "Then came she") within her hearing—but to the disciples. We may reverently believe that it was in the woman's faith that the Lord saw a revelation of His Heavenly Father's will that the temporary and dispensational barrier must on this occasion be broken down, that the "positive" command must not stand against the eternal moral and spiritual law that "all things are possible to him that believeth." It is possible that *v.* 26 marks, so to speak, the turn of the tide, but the Lord's exclamation in *v.* 28 suggests that it was in the woman's answer that He heard the guiding voice of the Spirit revealing to Him His Heavenly Father's will.

But there is another point of interest in the narrative which does not seem to have received much attention. The woman's request does not appear naturally to suggest the metaphor of bread. The metaphor is more easily understood if we remember how recently our Lord had fed the multitude with the loaves and fishes, and still more easily if we take into account the discourse at Capernaum recorded in John

vi. In this discourse, spoken of course with explicit reference to the preceding miracle, we note the recognition of two facts, that Israel was already rejecting the Bread of Life (v. 36), and that that Bread was to be given for the life of the *world* (v. 51). It may be that the Lord's mind, when He spoke of the children's bread, was still dwelling on the first of these facts, and perhaps also on the second. And how wonderful was the woman's unconscious echo of these two sayings and the quickness of intuition with which—taking the hint from the Lord's own words—she connected the two facts and urged that the dogs might at least be allowed to eat what the children did not want!

We seem then to have three links between the two miracles. The first—if the evidence of the Fourth Gospel be accepted—is the Lord's designation of Himself as the Bread of Life, offered first to unbelieving Israel, but destined ultimately for the whole world; the second is His designation of the benefits of the Kingdom as bread that belonged to the children, and must not be thrown to the dogs; the third is the woman's plea that the children had themselves furnished the answer to that objection, since they had allowed the bread to fall unappreciated from their table.

Is it fanciful to infer that the Lord's mind travelled along this route until He found Himself led by the Spirit to feed with literal bread a Gentile multitude, as He had previously fed a multitude of Israel? The woman had been right, both in her acceptance of the Lord's statement, and in the inference which she drew from it. It was "not meet to *take* the children's bread and to *cast* it unto dogs." But it was meet that the dogs should be allowed to eat what the children did not value. And here once again the Fourth Gospel gives us a suggestive hint. Quite apart from its explicit statement—indirectly confirmed by Matthew and Mark—that the enthusiasm raised by the feeding of the five thousand was of a

carnal nature, it tells us that the miracle, even as a miracle, was unappreciated (vi. 26), and that a day or two afterwards the Jews were asking for a sign in the form of bread from Heaven, thereby belittling by implication the marvellous work which Jesus had just performed. The bread had not only fallen, it had been rudely thrown from the children's table.

And surely it is not fanciful to contrast with this attitude of unbelief the attitude of the second crowd of whom Matthew tells us, (corroborated perhaps by Mark vii. 37.) that "they glorified the God of Israel."

With regard to the details of the two miracles, there is not very much to be said, but the differences are not unimportant. Dr. Swete has an interesting and valuable note (Comm. on St. Mark) dealing with the difference of locality. He remarks that in the first narrative the question raised is that of money, there being villages not far off, where bread might have been bought if funds had been available, while in the second it is simply the lack of bread that is remarked upon.¹

Besides the difference of place, there is a difference in the time covered by the two narratives. In the earlier narrative, Matthew and Luke—particularly Luke—indicate pretty clearly that the crowd had been with Jesus one day² (Matt. xiv. 15. Luke ix. 12), while on the second occasion we are expressly told (Mark viii. 2) that the period was three days.

The difference in numbers, both of the loaves and fishes and of the multitudes, has of course often been remarked upon. It has been justly urged that legend would naturally have embellished the later narrative by making the crowd larger and the provision smaller, whereas the Gospel story

¹ Note also, "divers of them came from far" (Mark viii. 3).

² The narrative in John vi. obviously points the same way.

does the exact opposite.¹ But it may be doubted whether anyone who really believed in miracles would trouble his head about such details.

The difference of the baskets, however, in number and kind raises an interesting question. The mention of *κόφιναι* in the one case and *σφυρίδες* in the other is itself, of course, an argument, so far as it goes, against the "doublet" theory, but there is a possible explanation of the difference between the numbers of the baskets which has never, so far as I know, been suggested, but which seems worthy of consideration. The twelve *κόφιναι* require of course no explaining—one need not repeat the familiar quotation from Juvenal—but the seven *σφυρίδες* are not similarly self-explanatory. I venture to suggest the following simple explanation. The *σφυρίς* was a basket used by fishermen, and it seems probable that seven of the twelve disciples were fishermen. I gather this from John xxi.—surely the narrative of an eye-witness—where we find seven of the disciples taking up what was presumably their old occupation of fishing. If by the word "disciples" we are, as seems probable, to understand the Eleven, one would naturally conclude from vv. 2, 3 that exactly seven out of that number were fishermen. If this be admitted, we have surely a fresh argument for the historicity of the second narrative as representing an incident distinct from the first.

One other difference in the narratives remains to be noted; on the second occasion Jesus entered "straightway" into the boat with His disciples, instead of sending them away while He dismissed the multitude.

I think, therefore, that the "doublet" theory is not only an unnecessary but an improbable hypothesis, and that the narratives may be accepted as they stand.

W. R. WHATELY.

¹ Unless, indeed, we are to lay stress on the fact that the fishes in the second narrative are said to have been small. But, even so, this would be a trifling point to set against the diminution of the crowd by 1000 (men).

THE RECORD OF A DEVELOPMENT.

WE are now used to the thought of development in Nature. It is the recognised scientific way of looking at the world, and men build the sepulchres of Darwin and Wallace, whose fathers stoned them. But what a changed point of view it is from the old ! Compare what it means to think of every species of animal and plant created just as it is, and remaining just as it is from beginning to end of its existence on this planet, and to think of animal and vegetable life as one unceasing career of change and progress and deterioration ; a struggle, a battle for survival, in which living things ever press up the ladder, and meet those who are retiring weary of the struggle. Yes, we see that those scientific doctrines explain a great deal that could not be explained before. For instance, with regard to imperfections and faults in nature, one had to admit before that God had created an imperfect world ; now one can say that God in aiming at perfection had to lead His creation through imperfect stages.

And the truth that life is a developing order is just as helpful when it is applied to the Bible. Here again we see in our criticism of to-day a wonderfully changed point of view. It was once possible to regard every line and word as equally inspired, every incident as equally a model for ourselves, every sentiment as equally admirable. The Bible, history, poetry, prophecy alike, was equally the result of the dictation of God, that the Christian might have, bound in a volume in his pocket, an oracle absolutely true in every detail. But now, in the light of development, the Bible to a certain extent takes its place with other history and poetry and works of religion : its history in its early parts is, like all history, subject to the imperfections of

man's primitive mind ; like all history, with the growth of civilisation, it became able to describe more truly, more adequately. In later stages it reads less of man's childish ideas into what it describes than it did at first. And in its poetical and devotional parts —the Psalms and the Prophets —we have varying strata of value, not always progressing with the march of time of course, but easily recognised heights and depths of inspiration. And all this is good news to the religious mind, that must have been sorely tried, if it had any acuteness, to make out a case for the morality of certain pages of the Bible, or for the worshipfulness of the God of the Old Testament. The teacher is now on comparatively easy ground, because he knows a little more of the truth. For what is the Bible to us to-day ? It is the record of the religious experience of the wonderful race, who were called by God to know Him better, to discover Him earlier than any other race. It shows stage by stage how they were ever making fresh and higher discoveries about Him, and ever gaining a deeper sense of His requirements in them, a firmer grip on His purpose and will.

When we say "religious experience" the key is given. For we point by the word to men who have gone through the experience, and either done what we find in the record, or written it. We find then behind the written words living men and women, who had uniquely grasped God's hand and lived in an atmosphere of nearness to Him. "Uniquely," I say, for it is in this unique sense of God that the Bible differs from all other books, and is qualified still to bring God into our lives. We do *not* find behind its text a Divine Voice which speaks uniformly without relation to the persons He selects to speak through. Bible people and Bible writers are not puppets and dolls, but *individuals* to the full and more than the full extent, and their message to us is analogous to the message of good men around us to-day.

It is that of the religious personality which brings the Divine through the human.

The opponent of Christianity is accustomed to attack the theology and the ethics of the Bible. Have we not often found, that if it is granted that the theology and ethics of parts of the Old Testament are imperfect, and permeated by primitive human notions, the ground is cut from under his feet? And it is quite fair to grant it; fair to him, and fair to ourselves and Christ. We are not concerned to defend Abraham, Saul or David, or the forms of primitive marriage, or the brutality of border warfare, or the nicety of Hebrew ritual, or the discrepancies of Jewish statistics — but we are out to set forth Christ as the culmination of all development, the Divine Man sent from God to begin a new order.

It is quite true that though all through the Bible you find one identical stream of religion, one procession of men of faith in God, yet you have a developing theology, for the men of faith described the God they knew and felt according to the more or less crude ideas of their own time, and sometimes ascribed natural events to His direct interposition, and if they were describing things in the far distance of the past, amalgamated with their record human fancies and poetical ideas which had sprung up, while the tales of Israel's early struggles were passing from mouth to mouth.

Thus we recognise in the early records the (from our point of view) false notion of God as the Race-God, who fights at the head of the armies of one people or race. We felt the tug of that old primitive mistake all through the war; we recognised its taint in some of our official prayers; it made prayer for victory sometimes difficult. The thought of our foes making the same appeal to the same God caused hesitation and disturbance of mind. We felt that nowadays we could not frame our prayers like the host of Joshua or

Gideon. Yet in their day it was quite right. It was a step on the road to the religion of the great prophets who came to understand that their own Jahveh was the God of the nations, the God of the universe. They came too to see as the individual's rights and duties became disentangled from those of the race, that God would not punish the son for the sin of his father, except in the outward physical sense, and that it was impious to say "the fathers have eaten sour grapes, and the children's teeth are set on edge," i.e. to ascribe one's own guilt to heredity, as so many people are ready to do to-day. To their highest thought God revealed Himself at last as a wonderfully holy, dreadful and mysterious Being outside of themselves, whose nature was one of love and tender mercy, but into whose counsels it was vain to try and penetrate. High and grand as the revelation was we realise that its steps were indeed only steps to the presentation of God in Christ as the Saviour-Son, and Indwelling Spirit with one immortal purpose for us all.

We have but to go to Christ's teaching to see that the ethics of the Mo-saic Revelation were imperfect. His "I say unto you" casts an inevitable reflection on what was said to them of old time. Morality now is to be "fulfilled" as an inward principle springing from the consecration of the most intimate spring of the self, not as mere obedience to external law. So we can place our key in the lock of many Bible difficulties. Obedience to command is lower than the developed state of him who has entered into sympathy with all the bearings of the command. The obedience of Abraham is magnificent, but it is the penalty of his place in civilisation that he does not know that God could not possibly want him to slay his son. Jehu's zeal for the Lord has its grand side in relation to the spirit of his times, yet when Hosea comes to examine it, he attributes all the ills of Judah to

Jehu's cruel ferocity. They were right, these rude heroes, in their sense that God was near them, and that something must be done for Him; they were as yet incapable of seeing what He wanted done, and how it should be done. And the men who told their story, like Deborah and Barak, had not yet the moral discrimination to praise what we have learned to admire: they seem often to praise what Christ teaches us to condemn.

But that is just the point. The Bible is the record of a development, and we stand at the end criticising with fuller light all that has gone before. For God, who in past days spoke through the old religions "in sundry portions and in divers manners," alike imperfect because in a vein adapted to, and proceeding through persons full of the passions and ideals of their own age, has in these last days spoken to us by His Son. It stands to reason that the words of that Son about the Father must be the one and only norm of theology. In their light all past knowledge and conjecture and revelation must be viewed, in their balance weighed. By the standard of His life, all past life and all future life must be measured. Such surely is the meaning of "The Father hath called Him to execute judgment because He is the Son of Man." Here in His Person is the apex towards which the struggling generations of prophets and wise men had patiently climbed, each in his turn winning some view of God, or human duty, which would be recapitulated, gathered up in the crown of the Perfect Man.

Let us take up our Bible with this spirit. Let us study it with this guiding principle. It calls for it, for study alone can help us to place the various books on their right rung on the ladder of development. And let us remember too that study of the ways and thoughts of other religions can explain some of the imperfections of Bible thought.

And study itself should more and more convince us of the

unique value of the Bible, if its appeal to all sorts and conditions of men were not enough. We shall find that unique value in its unique and continuous "*religion*," as distinct from its "theology" and "ethics." The religion, the faith in the same dim presence of surpassing Holiness, Power, Love and Mercy, working through the mysterious ups-and-downs of human life, in many minds, and under varying conditions, until at last it was manifested perfectly in the Son, in whom God was well pleased.

W. J. FERRAR.

THE RETICENCE OF JESUS.

THERE is a feature of Christ's character and ministry of which little is said, but it is very significant. The best name for it is reticence. Christ's silence is often spoken of and His self-restraint. We are struck with the words, "He was led like a lamb to the slaughter, and as a sheep before her shearers is dumb so He opened not His mouth." This wins our hearts. But Christ's reticence is something more than His silent acceptance of suffering. One feels there is so much more Christ might have told us but He chose not to speak; and that if only He had thought it right to let His power and His deeds be widely advertised, then events might have been different. A modern commercial mind seems to see Jesus missing His chances, and not making the most of His gifts. Christ would have nothing to do with these forcing tactics. He took the line of reticence; "He shall not strive nor cry; a bruised reed shall He not break."

Let me give one or two illustrations. When He had healed the leper, Jesus said to him, "See thou tell no man." After giving the two blind men their sight, Jesus strictly charged them saying, "See that no man know it." When they were come down from the Transfiguration, Jesus spoke to the

three disciples and "charged them that they should tell no man what things they had seen." And again when Peter had made the great confession that Jesus was "The Christ of God," "He charged them and commanded them to tell this to no man." Now there are, of course, reasons offered to explain each instance of this kind, but the frequency of the cases rather points to a settled principle of action; as if it were a bit of the clear and considered wisdom of Christ's mind. Once He said plainly, "Mine hour is not yet come"; just as though He was able to wait. And there is the saying, "I have yet many things to say unto you, but ye cannot bear them now." What an example of reticence this is! How few there are who could stop as Christ did, and forgo the excitement of teaching a new doctrine and putting the world straight. These instances will show what is meant by Christ's reticence. He expressed the quality perfectly in the pithy words which touch more things than giving alms, "Let not thy left hand know what thy right hand doeth."

A quality of this kind has much to teach us. It is such a contrast to the habits of the world and seems to reckon on forces we forget. It leaves alone so much that we are busy with, and calls to its aid a wisdom in which we are but children. As you read the Gospels you wonder what Jesus thought of the politics and social life of His country, and of the old religion; and yet there is hardly anything about them. Christ had no programme as we should call it, and began no school, and left behind Him scarcely so much as the outline of a fresh creed. It must have been very tempting to strike at the follies and delusions everywhere about Him, but He held His hand and preferred the way of reticence. And Christ's habit is in a high degree characteristic of the New Testament. I am impressed by its reticence: that it gives us hints of a greater revelation, flashes of light;

snatches of music, and little more than the ground-plan of the heavenly city. The truths are not worked out and applied in detail. We are given as it were a rough chart and a compass, and the land lies before us for exploration. How little, for instance, is told us of the inner mystic meaning of the Last Supper; and how lightly shaded is the picture of the after life, touched into almost one phrase, as "a being with Christ which is far better." The doctrine of the Trinity is there by suggestion more than definition; and the Atonement is left for us to unravel. So much more might have been said and yet God has been reticent. What is the meaning of it?

First of all it means that we are put on a probation of faith and experience, and are required to work out our own salvation. Just as the greatest ranges of light are beyond the visible spectrum, so the reaches of truth and Christian knowledge stretch on past the beginnings we see in the New Testament. It is not only science that makes discoveries. In Christian faith we are not shut down under the hatches, but on the ship's deck beneath the stars and encircled by receding horizons. It means that Christ trusted the growing experience of His children, and this means that the sifted experience of the Church has something to tell us of the things Christ at first left unspoken. We are to walk also by faith; and faith is versatile and adventurous. It does not sit dumb by the sheepcotes but loves to blaze the heather and it has made most of the discoveries and started most of the dreams by which men live. If Christ had not been reticent there would have been no need for faith, and Christian experience could have added nothing to Divine knowledge. It might have been easier for us, but who dare say it would have been better? The Christian faith would have become only an antiquarianism.

Christ's reticence means that He believed in the sufficiency

of the spiritual forces. He was for giving God time and for trusting the out-of-sight currents. This is the very opposite of worldliness which has confidence in princes and horsemen; in other words in strength of arm, and wealth and organisation. The wilderness temptations were aimed at Christ's belief in the sufficiency of the Spirit, and so at His reticence. They are the sharp worldly suggestion that you get on better if you eke out the spiritual forces with others. The devil knew a quick way of winning the kingdoms, and he was quite willing to teach Jesus. But Christ answered, "Get thee hence, Satan; thou shalt not tempt the Lord thy God." Bunyan hits the same point when Christian struggling along under his pack meets Mr. Worldly-Wiseman, who can tell him a shorter cut to the city, much quicker than by the wicket-gate. The separation between Christ and His disciples was partly their doubt of the sufficiency of the spiritual forces. It was not only their wrong idea of the kingdom, or that they wanted places of authority. They were not blind to what Jesus was working for, and they sympathised with it, or they would not have followed Him. But they were men of the world, and knew how things were done on the docks at Capernaum, and how you got a seat on the Sanhedrin. And they grew impatient with this reticent man, and wanted to push Him on, and get Him to use the thunderbolt. To it all Jesus answered, "My kingdom is not of this world." It is a question to put to ourselves whether we believe in the sufficiency of these spiritual forces; and how far when the world looks at us it may laugh in its sleeve—"Aha! are ye also become as one of us?"

The reticence of Christ also means His perfect self-mastery. I have seen this quality on a human scale in one or two men. They were mature, with the quiet and honourable joy in their power which only a complete self-mastery can give. I remember one such case, a man who might have had every

public distinction his Church could bestow, and the delight with which he spoke of the happy quiet life of pastoral service : " I dwell among mine own people." And nothing ever drew him into the fiercer heats of publicity. He had learned self-mastery as he watched the reticence of his great Master. Christ's self-mastery never failed. It is there like a beacon lamp burning above a wild sea. He was never panic-stricken and never driven to false courses. He knew His Father's business : and what a look there is in Him as He sets His face towards Jerusalem, the very last road which policy would choose. He could say with a simple natural courage, " I have overcome the world." Christ never lost His head, and never turned aside for one moment from the way of His life. Others could not understand, or would not see. They were flurried and excited and made all sorts of suggestions. Even Peter's loyalty broke away. But Jesus held on undisinayed and could say, " I must walk to-day and to-morrow and the day following." It was magnificent self-mastery.

The culmination is in the crucifixion. If Christ had said anything, or if He had tried to explain it to us — but the reticence of the Cross is overwhelming. " Father, forgive them, for they know not what they do " : as if He could have lifted the veil but He would not do so. Pierced through with many sorrows and bruised for us, Christ knew : and He left it all in God's keeping, and for the world to gaze in awe upon such suffering, and to find there its healing. And so He conquered, and is set down at the right hand of the throne of God, and the nations shall come to the brightness of His rising. The Galilean has won.

The secret of these things was Christ's fellowship with God. Christ came always to His work fresh from communion with God and from the contemplation of the Eternal. He was much in prayer and was acquainted with the spaces of

silence. It put the world in true perspective and taught Him just how little the world can do. Here is where we miss the way. The world is too much with us. The roar of its laden wagons is in our ears and the still small voice is lost in the din. As for reticence, Christ seems impracticable to us. Our idea is that if He came to-day He would send for the trade magnates and financiers and the advertisement writers, and smash through to victory. But He would not. He would look about again for twelve men to be with Him, men who would leave all and follow Him ; and if He could find them, He would shape them on the spiritual anvils, and teach them the older lessons of faith, obedience and love. There would be big results.

A. T. S. JAMES.

HOW FAR IS THE FOURTH GOSPEL A UNITY?

IV.

IN a previous paper¹ we developed the hypothesis that in the Fourth Gospel as we now have it there can be traced the work of three hands: (1) the memoirs of an eye-witness of Jesus whose motive was historical and biographical; this material we called "J." (2) The "Spiritual Gospel," or main body of the work, comprising the author's ("A") interpretation of the historical Jesus to the thought of his day and his estimate of Jesus' significance in men's experience. (3) A certain amount of redactional material which must be ascribed to a somewhat later editor ("R"). Of these three strata the first two have already been dealt with at length; it now remains to discuss "R." But first a word concerning two principles which must guide our discussion.

Firstly, the view held concerning the *order* of the strata both in time and in importance will be fundamental. We suppose J to be the earliest hand; that is, we hold that a definite historical outline *underlies* the spiritual interpretation of it, thus differing from those critics who affirm that the Gospel was originally built upon an "ideal plan," upon which "another plan has been *superimposed*, a chronological one, which has for its object to give a historically connected form to the Gospel."² On the other hand, we would put the

¹ EXPOSITOR, August 1922, p. 81.

² R. H. Strachan, *The Fourth Gospel*, p. 55.

main emphasis not on the memoirs of the eye-witness J, but on the work of the genius who constructed this material into a Gospel, thus differing somewhat from the view of Dr. A. E. Garvie in his recent book.¹ It is A who is the author in the true sense of the word ; the Gospel is *his* masterpiece ; he is " the poet of strong powers of thought " who has stamped upon the whole Gospel the marks of his individuality. This hypothesis, we submit, meets the facts better than the suggestion of, e.g., Burton that the material composing the body of the Gospel had for some time circulated in booklets among the Johannine communities as it came from John's hands, and that these booklets had then been collected and redacted into the Gospel as we have it. This theory would seem to exaggerate the part played by J in the construction of the Gospel in its present form, virtually promoting J to the position of author, while A is degraded to a mere redactor and given functions which will be better assigned to a separate and quite subsidiary hand R.

Our second principle closely follows from the first : we should frankly recognise that R *is* quite a subsidiary source (though, as we shall see, his work has had results for the interpretation of the Gospel quite out of proportion to his importance), that " the redactor " is merely the last resource of the despairing critic, and that therefore we should limit the R material as much as possible. We have no right, *except on clearly defined grounds*, to invoke his aid to cut our Gordian knots. Our conjecture is that many of the phenomena which suggest redaction may be adequately explained by the peculiar relation of the author, A, to the J material which he is in process of incorporating. A passage may present such difficulty to modern minds that

¹ *The Beloved Disciple*, by Princ. A. E. Garvie. Dr. Garvie would trace back to " the Witness " much that the present writer assigns to " A " (Dr. Garvie's " Evangelist ").

we would gladly find relief by rejecting it as an interpolation by R, and yet upon closer examination it may be found to reflect exactly the characteristic outlook of A; and not a few cases of apparent lack of smoothness and of diversity of viewpoint as between two collateral passages may be due to the outcropping of J rather than to the superimposing of R. We will illustrate this second principle, that the R material should be limited as much as possible, by considering some typical passages which are usually, but, we think, *incorrectly* assigned to R.

We have already seen that some of the "parenthetical comments" may be assigned not to R but to A himself, who is commenting on the J material which he is incorporating, and we illustrated this by a comparison of two typical comments, ii. 21 and xviii. 9. We may now add the following examples of comments by A which have been needlessly assigned to R:

vi. 46. This comment finds its setting in the midst of a series of just such pithy axiomatic sayings as we have seen may well be traced back through J to Jesus Himself. The whole passage indeed recalls the most famous of the "Johannine" passages in the Synoptics, i.e. Matt. xi. 25 ff. We may therefore assume that we have here J material which A has incorporated, and verse 46 is a comment by A upon it. A realises that the words of verse 45 might be misunderstood as implying that it is possible for a man to learn from the Father and come to know Him otherwise than through Jesus Christ, and so he inserts the comment emphasising the converse idea, that true knowledge of God can be acquired only through the Christ who alone possesses it. Verse 46 may show a diversity of viewpoint as compared with the immediately preceding verses; but the same thought is insisted on again and again throughout the Gospel (cf. especially xiv. 6), and there is no reason to

suppose that the hand to which verse 46 is due is other than that of the author of the Gospel as a whole.

vii. 39. Again the comment follows a pithy saying which may well be from J. The comment has all the marks of an A passage : it draws a spiritual interpretation from a material image ; it emphasises what is in fact one of A's dogmas, that the Holy Spirit was not given till the departure of Jesus ; it exemplifies the technical sense of the word "glorify," which is characteristic of A, referring simultaneously to the death, resurrection and ascension of Jesus, which in this Gospel are foreshortened into one event (cf. xi. 4 ; xiii. 31).

viii. 27 may seem to be out of touch with the realities of the situation and is accordingly often assigned to R. It is no doubt difficult to understand how, when Jesus spoke of One who had sent Him, and declared that He preached to the world a message first heard from that One, His hearers could fail to "perceive that He spake to them of the Father." Yet the Gospel abounds in just such allusions to the spiritual dulness of the Jews, and there seems no more reason here than in the previous passages for distinguishing verse 27 from its context as a comment by a later interpolator.

xii. 33 (cf. xviii. 32). Here the comment may seem to be made from a viewpoint lower than that of the preceding verse. Verse 32 attributes the universally attractive power of Christ to the fact of His exaltation into the realm of Spirit : verse 33 narrows the import of the saying by limiting the reference to Jesus' death upon the Cross. Yet one of A's most marked characteristics is a love of the symbolical, and Stanton's remark here is probably just, that it is "characteristic of mystical thought—that profound significance is seen in external acts and events. By the mystic they are regarded as sacramental."¹ A, we have seen, is

¹ Stanton, *Gospels as Historical Documents*, Part III, p. 59.

the prophet of Christian experience, and we should hesitate to deny the authenticity of any passage which is *true to experience*. And does not Christian experience justify the interpretation contained in verse 33 ? It is the Cross which gives Christ the power to "draw all men to Himself." We have seen too that in the thought of the Gospel the Cross is as it were the step of the throne upon which Jesus is at last "glorified."

Another set of passages, not strictly speaking "comments," has often been hastily ascribed to R, because they appear to make two distinct deductions from one event or statement, or to suggest two distinct causes for it. Thus the hand of R is traced in ii. 36-37 because Jesus' tears appear to be interpreted first as a sign of His love and then as a sign of His weakness ; and xii. 29 is rejected as indicating two contradictory explanations of the "voice out of heaven." It is really difficult to take such criticism seriously. As if a crowd were ever unanimous ! Surely these passages have no greater significance than as affording a capital example of how A adds life to his narrative by allowing us to overhear the remarks of Jesus' onlookers. He delights to picture the varied impression Jesus made on people and the diverse conclusions they formed concerning Him. If any further explanation is necessary of passages so perfectly natural, we have it in A's characteristic love of double interpretation, of playing upon the double meaning of a word. Thus in viii. 54 the word "glorify" appears to be used first in the ordinary sense of boastful self-praise and then in the peculiar Johannine sense noticed above. Is it really necessary in such passages to invoke the already overburdened scape-goat R ?

It has become the fashion, on the theory that the chronological outline has been superimposed on the "ideal" Gospel, to assign to R many of the definite notes of time in

the Gospel. This may possibly be the right solution in some cases, e.g. ii. 11, iv. 54, though even these appear more likely to be marginal glosses than comments by a later editor deliberately inserted in the text. But the hypothesis on which we are working would reverse the order of the strata, and accordingly we have suggested that, though some of the time notes may be due to R, the majority, if not actually to be assigned to A himself, are due to the out-cropping of J material and may even be the notes of an eye-witness. Thus i. 29, 35, 43 ; iv. 6, etc.

Finally a protest must be made against the custom of assigning to R any passage which occasions dogmatic difficulty. Naturally the temptation so to do is strongest in the case of the Johannine miracles, which admittedly present features of peculiar difficulty to modern thought. Accordingly a ready but quite arbitrary test is imposed upon any passage dealing with the miraculous. Wherever Jesus is represented as working miracles in order to increase men's faith in Himself, there, say the critics, is a spurious strain of thought, which must be due to the "Redactor." Examples of such passages are ii. 23-25 ; vi. 6, and, above all, the Lazarus narrative, especially xi. 12-15, 40-42. But though the modern mind may estimate at a low value faith based upon the miraculous, it does not follow that A would do so. As a matter of fact, from what we know of A's aim in writing the Gospel, it would be perfectly natural for him to emphasise the miraculous in the interest of faith. The Gospel is written "that ye might believe that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God," and, as Sanday says very justly, "the miraculous details fall in entirely with the author's purpose in writing. He sees in them so many striking illustrations of the glory of Christ. He had been himself keenly on the watch for manifestations of that glory, and he delighted to record them in the hope that they might

impress his readers as they had impressed him.”¹ The seven miracles narrated are evidently selected designedly for the sake of the discourses which they serve to introduce, and the aim of each discourse is to confirm the readers’ faith in Christ; e.g., the Feeding of the Five Thousand is narrated “that ye may believe” that Jesus is the “Bread of Life.” If the broad scheme of the Gospel thus enlists miracle in the service of faith, why should we cavil at the same alliance when we come to consider the verses in detail?

It is true that a twofold attitude towards the miraculous may be traced throughout the Gospel, for passages do occur in which faith based upon miracle is depreciated. Wendt recognises this when he distinguishes passages in which *ἐξογα* is used of Christ’s miracles (usually by Jesus Himself), from those in which *σημεῖα* is used; the latter, according to Wendt, emphasises the evidential value of miracle for faith, and he would assign the passages in which the term occurs to the “evangelist” (our A), as distinct from his original “source” (our J). Wendt would seem to build too much on the verbal distinction, for the term *σημεῖα* is used even by Jesus Himself and, indeed, in those very passages in which faith which requires miracle to confirm it is rebuked. And yet Wendt’s investigation would seem to corroborate our suggestion that the discrepancy of viewpoint in the Gospel, in the case of miracle as in so many other instances, may be best explained not by calling in R, but by recollecting the relation of A to the J material which he is incorporating. In short the emphasis put upon the miraculous in the interest of faith may be held to be a trait, not of R as contrasted with A, but of A as against J. The latter, approximating to the Synoptic viewpoint and being an eye-witness of Jesus’ own teaching, would probably depreciate faith which required a miraculous prop, and when this line

¹ Sanday, *Criticism of the Fourth Gospel*, p. 170.

of thought occurs we may take it as evidence that we are dealing with J material. Possible examples of such passages would be iv. 41-2 ; iv. 48 ; vi. 26, and (a passage, as we shall see later, of particular significance), xx. 29.

The incident of the Temple-cleansing, on account of its early place in the Gospel and the consequent ante-dating of Jesus' claims, has come under suspicion, and yet again R is called in to bear the blame. In the Synoptics this incident supplies the motive for the arrest of Jesus ; this purpose is of course served in the Fourth Gospel by the Lazarus story, and accordingly Wellhausen remarks of the Temple-cleansing that it is " a Synoptic narrative which has no proper place in " a Gospel, " whose motivation of the Passion (in the Lazarus episode) leaves no room for an assault of Jesus upon the Jewish authorities made so openly and with such impunity." ¹ But has it no proper place ? On the contrary this incident and its early place in the Gospel may be considered one of the keys to the right understanding of our problem. Perhaps " it has no proper place " in the strict historical sequence of events. But let us remember that A is not concerned to write history ; he is incorporating, for an apologetic purpose, the historical memoirs of J, and he never hesitates to displace an incident the better to serve his purpose. Now from A's point of view the incident has real doctrinal value. We have already discussed the significance of verses 19-21 : verse 21, so far from being a mistaken comment by R, is the key to the puzzle of the early placing of the incident in our Gospel. A with his usual disregard for mere chronological exactitude has ante-dated the episode because, with characteristic spiritual insight, he saw that it provided an admirable medium through which to present, *in the very forefront of his Gospel*, his fundamental Resurrection faith. The

¹ Quoted by Bacon : *The Fourth Gospel in Research and Debate*, p. 489

incident is introduced primarily for the sake of Jesus' saying in ii. 19 (preserved by J), and A points the desired lesson by adding his own comment in verses 21-22. It is needless to look for any trace of R here.

Similarly a large part of the Lazarus story, if not the whole, is generally rejected as due to R. But if A himself, for apologetic reasons, displaced the incident of the Temple-cleansing, it would be necessary for him to find some other event to which he might give the determining place in the dénouement of Jesus' life. If, in view of the silence of the Synoptics, it is impossible to accept the story as strictly accurate history, rather than introduce R we may suppose that A himself has worked up the story, possibly out of a similar but less sensational incident ¹ recorded by J, to take the place of the Temple-cleansing as the event which led to the Crucifixion. That this is the motive of the story is clear from many subtle touches (e.g. v. 16). In fact the very phrases which are commonly fixed upon as betraying the hand of R should rather be regarded as reflecting the motive which induced A himself to introduce the incident, and indeed on closer examination are found to be quite characteristic of A's general outlook. So verse 4: the sickness is that the Son of Man should be "glorified"; but this is not in the sense (held to be characteristic of R) of performing a miracle before an admiring crowd, but in the sense, which we have already seen to be so characteristic of A, according to which Jesus is "glorified" when He is crucified—the very motive for the introduction of the story (cf. vii. 39; xiii. 31). Similarly the motive for Jesus' delay in verse 6 is commonly presumed to be that the opportunity may be provided for the stupendous miracle of raising a putrefying corpse and the faith of the onlookers thereby strengthened

¹ Note for example the significant parallel between John xi. 4, 11, and Mark v. 39. In both cases Jesus denies that death has actually occurred.

(xv. 39-40). But the true motive appears to be that Jesus may be sure of His own mind and of the will of the Father before He hurries impetuously to certain death under the impulse, not of a divine command, but of His affection for the Bethany family. Verses 5 and 6 have a subtle connexion : " Now Jesus loved Martha and her sister and Lazarus. When he had heard *therefore* that he was sick, he abode two days still in the same place where he was," lest he should be carried off His feet by the fervour of His love. There are two other examples in the Gospel of a similar cause for delay : ii. 3-4 ; vii. 3, 6. As Strachan well puts it, " in all three cases human affection sought to bring pressure to bear on Jesus in connexion with His vocation, and in each case the interference is resented and repelled. Jesus does the will of God, and not the will of men." ¹ Now all this is thoroughly characteristic not of R but of the Gospel as a whole, that is of A : " No man taketh my life from me, but I lay it down of myself. I have power to lay it down, and I have power to take it again. This commandment have I received of my Father " (x. 18).

V.

Having thus deprived R of so many passages commonly assigned to him the reader may well be tempted to ask : is there any need to postulate the existence of a Redactor at all ? The answer must be in the affirmative, and for our comfort we may remember that it will probably be more easy to isolate the genuine R passages from J and A material than it was to distinguish the latter one from the other ; for, if our hypothesis is correct, unlike the J material the R additions being later will not have received the unifying stamp of A's marked individuality.

¹ Strachan, *op. cit.* 151

Granted that the relation of the author to his source accounts for many of the peculiarities of the Gospel there are still some phenomena which remain unexplained. Even the casual reader will note inserted comments which clearly misunderstand the context and are out of harmony with A's outlook and plainly on a lower spiritual level ; verses abruptly introduced which mar the artistry of A's scheme (interpolations), passages where gaps and seams are obvious and the sequence of thought becomes illogical and disjointed (dislocations) ; and finally whole sections which have manifestly been written up to serve a purpose other than that intended by the original author. How are these gaps, inconsistencies, dislocations, illogical connexions, best to be explained ? One feels that various ingenious theories of accident to the text, though they fit some cases with an almost uncanny accuracy, can hardly explain all ; for the damage is often most apparent in the oldest and best authorities, which we would hardly expect to be the case if the accident had befallen the text *after publication*. We therefore conclude that most of these phenomena can best be explained not by accidental disarrangement of the text, but by redactional interference ; they belong to the realm not of the Lower but of the Higher Criticism ; they are due not to Chance but to our Third Hand, R.

The problem of R's revision of the Gospel, if indeed we are to dignify his work with such a title, is best approached from the side of the Appendix, for here are most clearly defined both the motive dominating the revision and also several characteristic points of view which will usually be found reflected in the other R passages scattered throughout the body of the Gospel. It is now generally conceded that the Gospel as originally planned by the Author ended with xx. 31. The linguistic evidence alone is strongly against the authenticity of chapter xxi., but space forbids a dis-

cussion of this line of evidence.¹ There is no question at least that xxi. 24-25 are an addition. But these verses seem closely connected with the rest of the chapter, and if we amputate 24-25 not only do we leave the chapter without any suitable ending, but we deprive it of its whole *raison d'être*. For, as Bacon well says, “μαρτυρία,” “testimony,” “confession,” or “white and red martyrdom,” to use a phrase felicitously chosen to express the double sense of the Greek, is the subject of the whole paragraph, verses 15-24, and is illustrated in the respective fates of Peter and “the disciple whom Jesus loved.”² Even Zahn, “the Prince of Conservative Scholars,” agrees that not only verses 24-5 but the whole of chapter xxi. is due to a hand other than the author of the Gospel: “the traces of a hand different from that of the author of the book are observable not in verse 24 only, but already from xxi. 2 onward. The inference from this that the entire Appendix was attached by the friends of John who come distinctly to the front in verse 24 must be admitted.”³ Even those who still contend that chapter xxi. is by the same hand as the Gospel admit that “the 21st chapter is an afterthought” (Lightfoot). But it is difficult to understand why it should have occurred to the author to narrate these incidents only after he had brought his work to the impressive and carefully planned conclusion of xx. 30-31. With the exception of the allusion to the future of “the Beloved Disciple,” which must be discussed later, there is nothing in chapter xxi. which, on the supposition that it is the work of A, would not more naturally have been included in the body of the Gospel, had A desired to record it all. We can only conclude that the author of chapter xxi. had a motive for recording these incidents which the author of the Gospel as a whole had not. What

¹ For a good summary see Stanton, *op. cit.*, pp. 28 ff.

² Bacon, *op. cit.*, 193.

³ Quoted Bacon, *op. cit.*, 451.

was that motive ? To answer that question is largely to solve the problem of R's revision.

The main aim of the Appendix appears to be twofold :

(1) To emphasise the identity of the author of the Gospel with the anonymous disciple and by implication with John the son of Zebedee, and thus to secure Apostolic authority for the Gospel (*vv.* 20-24). This has so important a bearing on our hypothesis that it must be reserved for special treatment in Section VI.

(2) To bring the Gospel more into line with the dominant Synoptic tradition, and in particular to restore to Peter the position of supremacy among the Twelve which he occupies in the Synoptics. In verses 1-14 R reverts to the Galilean form of the tradition, whereby the Risen Jesus appears to the disciples not only at Jerusalem, as in our Gospels and also in Luke, but also in Galilee (*cf.* Mark xiv. 28). R would feel that this readjustment was specially needful on account of A's concentration of interest upon Jerusalem. Moreover R reintroduces this tradition in a way which also reasserts the leadership of Peter. The story of the miraculous draught of fishes, which in Luke v. 4-11 is narrated in connexion with Peter's first call, is here transferred to post-resurrection days in order to add colour to the new commission now given to Peter. This account of Peter's commission to the world is indispensable to R's purpose of reconciling the Gospel to the Synoptic tradition. His desire is to correct the impression, which might be gathered from the main body of the Gospel, that Peter was subordinate to the "Beloved Disciple." The important point to note is the close connexion of R's addition with Synoptic material. The resemblance both in thought and language with Luke v. 4-11 can hardly be accidental. (Compare Luke v. 5 and verse 3 ; v. 6 and verse 11 ; v. 8 and verse 7 ; v. 10 and the commission in verses 15-17.)

Now if these be the aims of R in adding the Appendix, similar motives may be expected to colour those passages in the main body of the Gospel which we also assign to R. As Bacon puts it (*op. cit.* p. 205, and I would here acknowledge indebtedness for much in the argument), "the appendix to the Fourth Gospel has every appearance of being an editorial epilogue, and is linked to a number of "parenthetic additions" of a redactional character attached to the substance of the Gospel." Following from this two points should be noticed: firstly, wherever we find similarity of thought and language as between the Appendix and parts of the Gospel, we should seriously consider whether this may rightly be regarded as a proof that the Appendix is from the hand of A, and not rather as a clue that in the particular portions of the Gospel in question we may expect to find traces of R: the latter supposition will more often prove correct. Secondly, it is most remarkable how often disarrangement of the text and dislocation of the argument, phenomena of course most suggestive of redactional interference, are found in close proximity to passages which reflect R's peculiar outlook as revealed to us in the Appendix and, in many cases, also show traces of Synoptic colouring.

Let us turn then to some of the passages which suggest that the redactional work of the author of the Appendix has been carried back into the body of the Gospel.

(1) There are throughout the Gospel a number of "parenthetic comments" other than those already ascribed to A, some of them needless explanatory glosses, others which so obviously misunderstand and degrade the spiritual significance of the words commented upon that we must hold them to be later editorial insertions. Some of these have been noted already and need not detain us. For examples cf. iii. 24; iv. 2; vi. 23; xi. 2; xviii. 9; xviii. 14.

(2) There is an important group of passages which we

would assign to R on the ground that they reflect the characteristics of the Appendix by either (i.) illustrating the desire to adjust the Gospel's plan more closely to that of the Synoptics, or (ii.) possessing in themselves a distinctly Synoptic colouring.

(a) As examples, not exhaustive, of such passages, we may notice the following as due to R: in anticipation it may be said that this conclusion is confirmed by other quite independent and much more forcible arguments.

iv. 43 ff. R may possibly have inserted the whole of this section, true to his plan of giving a more prominent place to the Galilean ministry. The reference to Cana in verse 46 seems superfluous except to remind us that Galilee had already shared in Jesus' miracles. So in verse 54 we are once again reminded that it was in Galilee, not Judæa, that the miracle just narrated was performed. Verse 44 is interesting as seeming to imply that Judæa and not Galilee is Jesus' "own country." Possibly R, remembering that Jesus was at least born in Judæa, has applied this Synoptic saying (cf. Matt. xiii. 57; Luke iv. 24) to the Judæan ministry in order to belittle its success in comparison with the Galilean ministry which he wishes to emphasise.

vi. 15. This passage attributes Jesus' withdrawal to His desire to escape recognition as the Messiah. This is a Synoptic idea alien to the genuine thought of the Gospel but occurring in other R passages, e.g., in iv. 1 ff., which (see below) is to be attributed to R for other reasons; Jesus apparently withdraws in order to prevent the Pharisees putting a Messianic interpretation upon His activity in baptizing. Throughout the Gospel, apart from R passages, Jesus' claims to the Messiahship are from the first undisguised; His earliest disciples acknowledge Him as such and He Himself declares His Messiahship to the Samaritan woman.

vii. 10. Here again we have the Synoptic idea that Jesus desired to disguise his Messiahship. The verse is R's attempt to explain the inconsistency of Jesus' action in going to Judæa in view of His refusal in verse 8. According to R His reason is reluctance to reveal His Messiahship, a misconception due to R's Synoptic point of view, for the true reason for the delay is that Jesus may be sure of His own mind and of God's will before He precipitates His arrest (cf. *supra*, Section IV., last paragraph). A always emphasises the complete publicity of Jesus' teaching and claims (cf. vii. 26, 28 ; xviii. 20).

(b) But it is in connexion with the passages concerned with Peter that R's attempt to adjust the Gospel to the Synoptic tradition is most manifest. When the Gospel left A's hand it possibly contained no account of Peter's Confession and almost certainly none of the Denial. To one brought up in the Synoptic tradition no such Gospel could be complete and R accordingly makes good the deficiency. To assign all these passages to R might appear to be unduly drastic criticism, the more so in view of our previous warning that we must not "draw unlimited cheques on the bank of the unknown," did they not display so clearly the infallible marks of R's handiwork, i.e. an obvious Synoptic colouring accompanied by interruption of the argument and even wholesale dislocation of the text. It is this disarrangement of the text in particular which inclines us to assign the passages in question to R ; for A is much too good an artist to allow such confusion to mar his masterpiece as it originally left his hand.

The Confession. vi. 66-71. The Synoptic colouring comes out (a) in the position of the paragraph which, as in the Synoptics, occurs immediately after the feeding of the 5,000 ; (b) in the words of the Confession, in verse 69, which are almost identical with those of Matthew xvi. 16. Possibly

the reference to Judas as "a devil" is a reminiscence of the scene, which in the Synoptics immediately follows the Confession, when Jesus uses the same term of Peter—"Get thee behind me, Satan" (Matt. xvi. 23). It must be freely admitted that these are extremely precarious arguments on which to condemn the Confession passage, and the assignment to R cannot be insisted upon. We may note, however, in confirmation, that one of the most serious dislocations of the Gospel text has taken place just at the point where these verses occur: chapter v. has been transposed from after to before chapter vi.

The Denial Passages. These may be assigned to R with much more confidence. Peter's boast of loyalty (xiii. 36 ff.) and his failure to live up to it (xviii. 15 ff.) have been inserted in the body of the Gospel while his reinstatement by Jesus is reserved for the Appendix (xxi. 15 ff.).

xiii. 36-38. Chapter xx., which is agreed to be the conclusion of the Gospel in its original condition, contains no hint of any sense of shame on the part of Peter in consequence of his denial, which may suggest that there was no reference to the denial in the body of the original Gospel. On the other hand, the connexion of xiii. 36-38 with the reinstatement passage in the Appendix is too obvious to be ignored; the relation of Peter's offer to "follow" in xiii. 37 to Jesus' command to "follow" in xxi. 19 is unmistakable and suggests that both passages alike are from the hand of R.

The accompanying dislocation of the argument and of the text affords stronger proof still that the passage is an interpolation by R. xiii. 36-38 clearly interrupts the original connexion between xiii. 35, the "new commandment" of love one to another, and chapter xv. (which originally followed xiii.) containing the parable of the Vine and the Branches by which Jesus illustrates and enforces "the new commandment." Compare xiii. 34 with xv. 12. This is

recognised even by those who regard xiii. 36-38 as genuine, and accordingly the usual plan is to transpose xiii. 33-38 to follow after xvi. 33 (we would prefer to make the break at verse 35, leaving verses 33-35 in their present position at the close of chapter xiii. : the connexion between verses 32 and 33 is satisfactory enough, while that between verse 35 and xv. 1 is perfect). No doubt this is the position in which R originally inserted xiii. 36-38, for xvi. 31-32 ("ye shall be scattered every man to his own") is the Johannine counterpart of Jesus' Synoptic prediction that "I will smite the shepherd and the sheep shall be scattered" (Mark xiv. 27). In fact John xvi. 31-33 plus xiii. 36-38 is an exact parallel to Mark xiv. 27-31. Jesus' complaint in xvi. 5 must surely have originally preceded Peter's question in xiii. 36. Yet even in this position at the end of chapter xvi. the section xiii. 36-38 obviously interrupts the sequence of the Last Discourse as we may conceive it to have been originally constructed by A. The connexion between xvi. 33 ("be of good cheer; I have overcome the world") with xiv. 1 ("let not your heart be troubled") is quite too apt to admit of any interpolation at this point. Once we excise xiii. 36-38 as due to R, and only then, can the whole section be arranged in perfect sequence, thus: xiii. 1-35; xv., xvi., xiv., xvii.

Our study of this R interpolation may perhaps even suggest to us an explanation of the notorious displacement of chapter xiv. from its original position after xvi. to its present position before xv. As we have seen xiii. 36-38 was originally inserted by R at the end of chapter xvi. A later copyist had sense enough to observe that the sequence from xvi. 33 to xiv. 1 was thus violently interrupted, and as he searched round for an alternative context the present position after xiii. 35 was suggested to him by *the apparent connexion* of xiii. 36, "whither I go thou canst not follow

me now," with xiii. 33, "whither I go ye cannot come." (Note. As a matter of fact Jesus explains the riddle of xiii. 33 not in xiii. 36-38 but in xvi. 28, as the disciples admit in the following verse 29. There are a number of such artificial or "engineered" connexions in the Gospel: note an exact parallel in a supposed connexion between viii. 14 and viii. 21, though when the text is correctly rearranged a large section of chapter vii. intervenes between these two verses: Burton indeed places viii. 12-20 in the middle of chapter x. Note also the quite artificial but outwardly satisfactory connexion between chapter vii. verses 14 and 15, and also between chapter iii. verses 30 and 31, though once again in both cases rearrangement shows that the connected verses really belong to quite distinct sections; for a discussion of the whole subject see an article in the *Expository Times*, November, 1921, p. 74.) The passage was therefore transposed to its present position before chapter xv., and in process of subsequent copying *it may well have carried chapter xiv. with it.* The above example is the clearest possible proof of the intimate connexion between interpolated Synoptic material and the notorious dislocations of the text of the Fourth Gospel. Wherever these two phenomena are seen in conjunction there is at least the probability that R has been at work.

xviii. 15-18, 24-27. The account of Peter's denial should be assigned to R for the same two reasons. The whole section xviii. 12-27 is hopeless as it stands. Note (1) Jesus is first led to the house of Annas (13). In the same verse and again in 24 Caiaphas is distinctly named as the High Priest, a statement of course historically correct. Yet in verses 19, 22, 24 the official before whom Jesus is being tried—presumably Annas, for it is not till verse 24 that Jesus is sent to Caiaphas—is repeatedly called High Priest. This difficulty can only be overcome either by omitting verse 24

and assuming (surely somewhat unnaturally in view of the phrase in verse 15, "went in with Jesus into the palace of the High Priest," which taken in connexion with verse 13 can hardly mean anything but the house of *Annas*) that from the first it is Caiaphas before whom the trial is being conducted, and that it is to him that the title High Priest in verses 19, 22, 24 refers ; or else by arbitrarily translating the pure aorist ἀπέστειλεν in verse 24 as a pluperfect, which the A.V. translators perceiving the difficulty have actually done. (2) The scene is completely changed at verse 24, and yet verse 25 represents Peter standing and warming himself in exactly the same position as in verse 18 before the change of scene takes place. The true sequence of events is probably that Jesus was tried before Caiaphas in the house of Annas, where He is detained until at verse 28 He is led to the Prætorium. But R by prematurely changing the scene at verse 24 has reduced Peter's position to absurdity as noted above. As Prof. Bacon has shown (op. cit. 485), the confusion is immediately explained once we realise that R, as usual, has interpolated Synoptic material and thereby dislocated the text. Note the close parallel with Mark xiv. 53 ff. John xviii. 15-18 is equivalent to Mark xiv. 54. In Mark the story of the denial is at this point interrupted by verses 55-65 ; then in verse 67 we have the second reference to Peter standing and warming himself. R, closely following the source from which he is interpolating, also inserts a second reference to the warming at verse 25*a*, in spite of the change of scene at verse 24. Of course a tolerably satisfactory sequence can be secured by transposing verse 24 after 13 and 19-23 after 15. This order, it is interesting to note, is actually found in the Sinaitic Syriac ; but this probably proves no more than that the hopeless confusion of the present text was early recognised and that there were skilled textual critics before the days of Spitta !

But all such ingenious transposition is rendered superfluous once the R sections (15 or 14-18, 24-27) are excised.

On similar grounds one is tempted to surmise that certain of the passages dealing with John the Baptist may be later interpolations by R, for in conjunction with these, too, there occurs serious disturbance of the text. There are seven passages in the Gospel which refer to the Baptist (i. 6-8, i. 15, i. 19-40, iii. 23-30, iv. 1-3, v. 32-36, x. 40-42), and no less than five of them are accompanied by textual dislocation. The exceptions are i. 19-36, which (with the possible exception of verses 20-23), is quite clearly part of the original Gospel and leads up to the call of the disciples, and v. 32-36, which is also certainly authentic; we may note that these two passages are obviously related, v. 33 referring back to the sending of the deputation in i. 19, and both may be assigned to A.

Let us consider now the remaining five passages :

i. 6-8. These verses clearly interrupt A's exposition of his Logos doctrine, for verse 9 would very fittingly follow verse 5. If it be true that the prologue is written in the form of a hymn to the Logos, then there is no place for these prose verses in the scheme of distiches and tristiches, each showing a more or less complete parallelism within itself, into which the hymn naturally falls. In any case the whole passage 1-18 is so carefully composed that we can hardly believe that the author himself is responsible for the violent interruption caused by these verses. R has perhaps modelled verses 6-8 on the genuine passage v. 35 f.

i. 15. This verse similarly interrupts the clear connexion between 14 and 16, and is moreover a quite superfluous anticipation of verse 27.

iii. 22-30. The whole passage seems to be an interpolation. Even if it be genuine it should be transposed to follow after ii. 12. In its present position it violently interrupts

A's reflections upon Jesus' words to Nicodemus. In spite of the artificial connexion with verse 30 the real connexion of 31 is with 21, verse 31 elaborating the contrast between "every one that doeth evil" and "he that doeth truth." It is interesting to note that this interpolation may have led to the displacement of the entire dialogue with Nicodemus, if indeed Bacon, following the order of Tatian, is right in his surmise that the section should be placed immediately before vii. 31 (Bacon, op. cit., 510, 518). This position is very attractive, for Jesus' teaching on the "new birth" by water and the Spirit finds a most appropriate setting in the ritual of the Feast of Tabernacles when water was drawn in golden pitchers from the Pool of Siloam. There seems to be an allegorical reference to this rite in vii. 37-39. Again, if the story of Nicodemus is the Johannine parallel to the Synoptic story of the Rich Ruler, then this incident, if originally placed before vii. 31, would occupy the same relative position as regards historical sequence as its parallel in Mark x. 13-31 (Bacon, 382).

iv. 1-3. Verse 1 has already been suspected as due to R and the two following verses should perhaps also be thus assigned. The language is clumsy and involved, the sudden reference to the Pharisees seems pointless; and possibly the text as we have it is the result of a combination of the original reading and R's editing. Spitta suggested that *Ἰησοῦς* should be transferred to the place of *ὁ κύριος*, and that the clauses *ὅτι ἤκουσαν οἱ Φαρισαῖοι* and *καίτοιγε . . . μαθηταί* should be considered as due to R: "When therefore Jesus knew that he was making and baptizing more disciples than John, he left Judæa, and went away again into Galilee." Again, the point of verse 2 is obscure, unless it be once more to emphasise the superiority of Jesus to the Baptist. Finally it has been noted that *καίτοιγε* is a "hapax legomenon" in the New Testament. Perhaps

it is significant that here too Bacon, again following Tatian's order, suggests that the section immediately following, the interview with the Samaritan woman, has been displaced from its original position at the end of chapter vi. (op. cit. 504, 511, 514).

x. 40-42. These verses are probably also due to R. Dr. Strachan ¹ notes a number of grammatical peculiarities, and one suspects that this may be one of the links inserted by R for the sake of preserving historical sequence—in this case to translate Jesus to the locality beyond Jordan where He is when Lazarus dies. Once again the text in close proximity has suffered serious dislocation. Burton would rearrange chapter x. thus : x. 19-21 (insert here viii. 12-20), x. 22-29, 1-18, 30 ff.

Enough has been said to illustrate our contention that the chief marks of R are interpolation, always with a definite motive and usually of Synoptic material, and a consequent disarrangement of the text. But if these Baptist passages are indeed due to R can we suggest any motive for their interpolation ? It will be noted that each of the passages in question pointedly emphasises the inferiority of the Baptist to Jesus. Since Baldensperger put forward his theory this motive has, of course, been commonly ascribed to the Gospel as a whole, one of the polemical aims of which has been held to be to counteract an exaggerated estimate of the Baptist current at Ephesus where the Gospel was written. In support of this theory Acts xviii. 25, xix. 3-4, is quoted as proving the existence of a school in Ephesus which acknowledged only John as its Master. Is it possible that this polemical motive is characteristic, not of the Gospel as a whole, but rather of R, and that one of the objects of this later revision was to warn readers against too high a valuation of John the Baptist ? It is true that even i. 19-28,

¹ *Expository Times*, xxvii. 237.

which we have assigned to A, appears to be coloured by the same motive ; but even here verses 20–23, where the reiteration of John's inferiority is most marked, have been suspected on the ground that 24 harks back curiously to 19. In any case this passage alone, apart from the remaining passages which we have seen reason to assign to R, would hardly have suggested that A had any such polemical motive in view, any more than the passages in Acts taken by themselves would lead us to suppose that the school in question exalted John above Jesus. The implication is surely not that Apollos and his pupils gave to John a homage that was Jesus' due alone, but merely that as yet they were not acquainted with the rite of Christian Baptism. It may well be that in later years there was a Baptist party, probably Jewish, which sharply opposed itself to the orthodox Church. There is indeed a definite reference to such a sect in the Clementine Recognitions : " Some even of the disciples of John, who seemed to be great ones, have separated themselves and proclaimed their own master as the Christ." ¹ Is it possible that this tendency was already apparent when R revised the Gospel, and this led him to emphasise the truth already implicit in the Gospel (i. 19–27, v. 32, 36), that John was no rival but rather the humble witness to the Christ ? On the whole we are probably right in assuming that the polemics of the Gospel are chiefly due to R : A, in the words of Dr. Drummond, ² " stands above ephemeral controversies, and addresses the universal Church, and his Gospel, far from being a polemical pamphlet, is the utterance of one of those rare souls who speak with timeless voice to the permanent needs of men."

Note.—Since the above article was written Principal A. E.

¹ Quoted by E. F. Scott, *The Fourth Gos* 2*cl.* 1. 80.

² *Character and Authorship of the Fourth Gospel*, p. 23.

Garvie has published his *Studies of the Fourth Gospel*. In view of a certain similarity in the line of argument and results arrived at, particularly as regards the passages to be ascribed to the Redactor, it should perhaps be noted that the article was completed before the writer had opportunity to consult Dr. Garvie's work and in entire independence of his conclusions.

G. H. C. MACGREGOR.

MARK'S "STRAIGHTWAY"

No feature of Mark's Gospel is more familiar than the constantly recurring *εὐθύς*.¹ It seems rather surprising therefore that commentators, writers of the more technical New Testament "Introductions," and others who have published studies of this Gospel, have devoted so little attention to it. Nearly all of them make some mention of the phenomenon, it is true. Zahn, for example, has the following remark:—"The much repeated *καὶ εὐθύς* . . . and the likewise frequent *πάλιν* and *καὶ πάλιν* will perhaps weary a reader attentive to the style, but on the other hand show the vivacity of the narrator" (*Int.* II. 482). With respect both to its brevity and its substance this is a quite typical note.

Dalman takes Mark's "straightway" somewhat more

¹ On the use of the forms *εὐθύς* and *εὐθέως* in the New Testament and in other Greek writings see Abbott, *Joh. Grammar*, pp. 19-22. But Abbott's contention for a distinction in meaning between the two (*εὐθύς* meaning *straightway*, and *εὐθέως* *immediately*) seems fanciful. As a matter of fact it is difficult to know which form Mark actually used. (Cp. Merx: "Ich ignoriere dabei völlig den Umstand dass DA *εὐθέως*, B *εὐθύς* zu schreiben pflegen, aber nicht konsequent . . ."—*Die vier kanonischen Evangelien*, p. 17). This uncertainty is reflected in our most used texts and concordances. Bruder's Concordance lists nearly all of the Markan occurrences under *εὐθέως*, which policy Moulton & Geden reverse. Similarly the reader of Souter's *Novum Testamentum Græce* will frequently find *εὐθέως* confronting him where Tischendorf or Westcott & Hort have taught him to expect *εὐθύς*.

seriously, devoting approximately a page to discussion of it. He notes that the word occurs in Mark forty-five times, Matthew eighteen, Luke eight, John seven. The Old Testament "has nothing corresponding." Nor does the rabbinic literature "exhibit any such usage *with the same frequency*; but there can be no doubt that its common use of מֵיָדָא, יָדָא מֵיָדָא represents the Aramaic prototype presupposed by the evangelists. . . . Its excessive frequency in Mark must depend on the particular predilection of the author, and is due probably to Greek rather than Jewish-Aramaic influence" (*Words of Jesus*, 28-29). This at all events shows a realisation of the fact that Mark's εὐθὺς presents a problem—is a thing which needs to be explained. In this respect it marks a distinct advance over such comments as that of Zahn.¹

Another noteworthy contribution is that of F. C. Burkitt, in his *Evangelion Da-Mepharreshe* (II, 85-89). It is given as an appendix to the discussion of the linguistic features of this Syriac version of the Gospels, known to us through the MSS. designated Curetonian (C) and Sinaitic Syriac (S). Professor Burkitt tabulates the Syriac renderings of εὐθὺς found in S, C, and Syr. vg. (i.e. the Peshitta), all four Gospels being included in the reckoning. He then devotes similar, though briefer, notice to the Fourth Gospel's οὕτως, but with this we are not at present concerned. With respect to Mark's use of εὐθὺς the point of main interest brought out by the table is that the Syriac in a considerable number of instances has no equivalent for the word, and (though in his discussion Burkitt takes no notice of this) that such omissions are a good deal more numerous in the older than in the later Syriac. Burkitt's conclusion, summed up in two paragraphs, I shall quote in full:—

¹ E. A. Abbott (*Joh. Grammar*, p. 20) has a suggestion that "Very likely Mark's εὐθὺς may be a loose rendering of an original Semitic 'behold.'"

"In the course of working at the Syriac equivalents for S. Mark's $\epsilon\theta\theta\acute{\upsilon}\varsigma$ and S. John's $\omicron\delta\nu$ it has occurred to me that fundamentally they mean the same thing, and that they really correspond to the Hebrew 'wāw consecutive.' Not, of course, that either of these Gospels is a translation from the Hebrew: but if the authors of these Gospels were familiar with the Old Testament otherwise than through the awkward medium of the LXX, they might well have felt themselves in need of something to correspond to the Hebrew idiom. The essence of the meaning of 'wāw consecutive' is that the event related is regarded as happening in due sequence to what has gone before. To [express this $\kappa\alpha\iota$ is too inadequate a link, while $\delta\epsilon$ implies a contrast which is wholly wanting in the Hebrew; the turn of thought is more or less like our English 'and so.' But this is exactly what S. Mark means by his $\kappa\alpha\iota \epsilon\theta\theta\acute{\upsilon}\varsigma$, and it is what is generally meant in the Fourth Gospel by $\omicron\delta\nu$. Simon's wife's mother was sick of a fever *and so* they tell Jesus of her ($\kappa\alpha\iota \epsilon\theta\theta\acute{\upsilon}\varsigma$ Mark i. 30): S. Mark does not mean to emphasise the haste they were in to tell the news. Similarly in S. John there are literally scores of verses beginning with $\epsilon\iota\pi\epsilon\nu \omicron\delta\nu$ or $\epsilon\lambda\pi\omicron\nu \omicron\delta\nu$ where 'he said therefore' brings out far too prominently the idea of causation. All that is meant is וַיֹּסֵף 'and so he said,' or 'and so they said,' as the case may be.

"The *Evangelion da-Mepharreshe* is the translation of the Gospels which of all others is nearest in spirit to the evangelists themselves. That this translation so often omits $\epsilon\theta\theta\acute{\upsilon}\varsigma$ in S. Mark, and so often omits $\omicron\delta\nu$ in St. John or translates it by a simple 'and,' is strong evidence that these particles are in their essential meaning nothing more than a copula—a copula, it may be, with a certain nuance, but still merely a copula."

So much for Burkitt. With his discussion should be compared that of A. Merx, who also became interested in the problem through a study of the Gospels in the older Syriac. In his *Die vier kanonischen Evangelien nach ihren ältesten bekannten Texte* (i.e. the Sinaitic Syriac) he devotes some seven pages (pp. 16-23) to an investigation of Mark's $\epsilon\theta\theta\acute{\upsilon}\varsigma$.

Merx does not fail to note how much more frequent the omission of $\epsilon\theta\theta\acute{\upsilon}\varsigma$ is in S. than in Syr. vg. Nor is he content with this: he proceeds to summon an array of other witnesses. Aethiopian, Armenian, and Latin (old and vg.) readings, in addition to the two types of Syriac, find a place in his table: and in the discussion which follows the

Egyptian versions (Sahid. and Memph.) and the Gothic of Ulphilas also play a part. Moreover he finds that the evidence gathered from these other sources agrees in the main with that of the Syriac; i.e. wherever one looks, as Merx thinks, one finds a more primitive type of text in which *εἰθύς* is of rare occurrence and a later type in which the occurrences of the word are more nearly as in the Greek MSS. regarded as standard to-day. The conclusion to which Merx is led is quite different from that which Burkitt had reached. Merx's conclusion is simply that in the primitive text of Mark the awkward *εἰθύς*, in a large proportion of its occurrences, was not found (" . . . dass *εἰθύς* vielfach in der Vorlage von Syrsin nicht existierte, inzwischen aber im Griechischen eingesetzt, in der Pesch erscheint. Auch bei dem Arm, dem Äthp und den Altlateinern fehlt es öfter noch").

But Merx does not stop here. He proceeds to tell us how we can learn, approximately, which of the familiar occurrences in Mark are not original. He observes that in the cases where the Pesh. translators found a *εἰθύς* in their Greek which had no equivalent in the older Syriac they rendered it, to be sure, but rendered it with a different word from that used elsewhere. This word is *mech'da* (מחרא). The next step in the demonstration is to point out that in the Latin *statim*, and in the Aethiopic *sobēhā*, play a rôle similar to that of *mech'da* in the Syriac. From which comes the further important conclusion that "wo lateinisch *statim*, syrisch מחרא, äthiopisch *sobēhā*, steht [ist] das *εἰθύς* Einschub und unecht."

The investigations which we have thus far noticed have all been of rather an incidental sort; i.e. the writers had concerned themselves with Mark's *εἰθύς* only because it got in their way, so to speak, as they were dealing with other and larger problems. As far as I know there is extant

only a single attempt to discuss the phenomenon in thorough-going fashion as a problem in itself. I refer to an article entitled *εὐθύς bei Markus*, by J. Weiss, which appeared in the *Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft* for 1910 (pp. 124-33).

Weiss begins by referring to the extraordinary frequency with which the word occurs, and calls attention to the fact that while in some passages its use seems natural in others it does not:—"Wir können allenfalls noch verstehen wie Markus sagen kann i. 12: καὶ εὐθύς τὸ πνεῦμα αὐτὸν ἐκβάλλει εἰς τὴν ἔρημον—aber was besagt nun καὶ εὐθύς τοῖς σάββασιν ἐδίδασκεν i. 21 oder καὶ εὐθύς ἦν ἐν τῇ συναγωγῇ αὐτῶν ἄνωγειος . . . καὶ ἀνέκραξεν i. 23? Hier liegt ein luxuriöser Gebrauch vor, der bisher nicht erklärt ist."

The next observation is that Mark's *εὐθύς* is often missing in the parallel passages in Matthew and Luke; and not only so: in the Greek MSS. and the early translations it is often lacking from the text of Mark itself—notably in the case of the Sinaitic Syriac.

This last point leads naturally to a reference to the theories of Burkitt and Merx, and Weiss proceeds to summarise and criticise those theories. We shall find it of interest to note what he sees in them to approve and to what extent his criticism is adverse.

Burkitt's solution does not commend itself to him. His objection is three-fold:—(1) It does not account for the fact that in the *later* Syriac the occurrences of *εὐθύς* agree, in the main, with those of our familiar Greek texts: "auch sie hätten doch empfinden müssen, dass nur eine Copula vorliege." (2) It does not take into account the frequent suppression of *εὐθύς* by Matthew and Luke: "Soll man auch bei ihnen dies semitisierende Gefühl annehmen?" (3) If Mark had been influenced by a Semitic "Gefühl" it is unlikely that he would have used καὶ εὐθύς, thus

practically repeating the *wāw*. ("Wenn er noch semitisch fühlte warum dann die doppelte Wiedergabe von ו?")

With the view of Merx Weiss finds himself in much closer sympathy. Indeed the underlying thesis of a primitive Markan text differing in many particulars from that which we possess is almost an axiom with him. He feels, however, that Merx's theory, based almost entirely on text-criticism, needs to be supplemented by evidence from the side of Synoptic criticism, and to this task he consequently sets himself.

The *εὐθὺς* of our Markan text is often absent from the parallel passages in Matthew and Luke. So much is obvious to everyone. And are not Matthew and Luke earlier witnesses to the primitive text of Mark than even the Sinaitic Syriac? But the case of *εὐθὺς* is by no means unique in this respect. A lot (eine Menge) of the characteristically vivid features of the Markan narrative as we know it are lacking in the parallel portions of Matthew and Luke. This "softening down" of Mark, says Weiss, has never been satisfactorily explained. Nor is it possible to explain it, because in reality nothing of the sort has occurred. On the contrary our conclusion must be that many of these features which we are wont to call characteristic of Mark were not present in the primitive Mark, as used by Matthew and Luke, at all. Among these is to be classed "das häufige *εὐθὺς*."

Weiss next proceeds to show, by a detailed examination of passages, how far from unanimous the textual evidence for Mark's *εὐθὺς* is. Special weight is given to the synoptic evidence, though the witness of MSS. and versions is also taken into account. This occupies the greater part of the article. The conclusion drawn from the data is that in only seven passages is the word certainly authentic. Add to these three others that are probably so and we have a total

of ten—out of forty-eight which have more or less evidence in their support.¹ Weiss does not claim infallibility for these figures. Nevertheless, he maintains, the direction in which they point is clear:—"Mit einiger Sicherheit dürfen wir sagen, dass das *εὐθύς* in dem alten Markus, der dem Matthäus und Lukas vorlag, in weiten Umfange noch gefehlt hat."

The point to which Weiss brings us, then, is precisely the same as the point already reached through the arguments of Merx, though the route traversed in getting there is somewhat different.

II.

The discussions summarised in the preceding paragraphs comprise all the worth-while literature on the subject, as far as my observation goes. We must now ask whether, or to what extent, the problem has been solved.

It will be seen that the proposed solutions follow one or other of two lines: (1) Semitic influence; (2) later interpolation. We shall consider these in turn.

(1) Under the head of Semitic influence falls Dalman's suggestion that an Aramaic prototype is to be found in the common use of *כֵּן, יָד, כֵּן*. This however need not detain us long. It is certainly possible that familiarity with this Aramaic locution may be reflected in Mark's *εὐθύς*, though it would be difficult to prove. But even if we grant the fact it does not take us far. It does not appear that any one of the more difficult occurrences of the word is made one whit easier to understand by the application of this hypothesis, and as Dalman himself notes it has no value in explaining the excessive frequency of the occurrences.

¹ As a matter of fact there are fifty. Weiss for some reason omits v. 42b and ix. 24. The complete list is given farther on.

We have already noted Weiss's objections to Burkitt's theory. As to the first of these, it is true that Burkitt does not explain why the later Syriac differs in marked degree from the earlier with respect to the rendering of *εὐθύς*, but it remains possible that this can be explained without doing violence to his hypothesis. For example, we might assume that in the case of the later translators the Semitic sense was outweighed by a desire to render the Greek word with some degree of literalness. Nor is the second objection as weighty as might at first appear. There is after all no inherent reason why the Sinaitic Syriac might not have omitted Mark's *εὐθύς*, in many of its occurrences, for the reason which Burkitt suggests and Matthew and Luke have omitted it on quite other grounds—especially as the passages in which it is omitted are by no means uniformly the same. As to what the reason in the case of Matthew and Luke may have been we shall have a word to say by and by. The third objection does not seem to have much weight. I fail to see that Burkitt's theory, rightly understood, involves a "doppelte Wiedergabe von 1." ¹

Burkitt's suggestion, as it seems to me, remains an interesting but scarcely conclusive hypothesis. Scarcely conclusive for three reasons at least. Burkitt, it will be remembered, disavows any notion that Mark may be a translation from the Hebrew. He thinks that we need assume only a general familiarity with the Hebrew idiom of the Old Testament on the part of the author in order to make the repeated use of *καὶ εὐθύς* for *wāw* consecutive quite comprehensible. It may be so. In the case of the Fourth Gospel's *οὕτως* I should not find it hard to believe. But I doubt whether *εὐθύς*—an adverb with a very definite meaning of its own—can be made to play so vague and colourless a part.

¹ I assume that Burkitt intends his explanation to apply only to the expression *καὶ εὐθύς*—not to *εὐθύς* alone. See below.

Again, is the hypothesis really workable? One wonders if Burkitt went to the trouble to try it out in all the Markan passages where *καὶ ἐὺθὺς* occurs. For example, take i. 23—one of the cases cited by Weiss as illustrative of the apparent meaninglessness of *ἐὺθὺς* in some of Mark's uses. If we have a wāw consecutive construction here verse 23 must presumably be connected closely with 22b, and we would have to render in some such fashion as this:—"For he taught them as having authority and not as the scribes, *and so* there was in their synagogue a man with an unclean spirit," etc. The connexion seems rather forced. Of course it would not be fair to over-stress the "so," since the actual uses of the construction in the Old Testament are so various, but unless we find some sort of close connexion between what follows *καὶ ἐὺθὺς* and what precedes any theory which lines it up with the Hebrew wāw consecutive is likely to seem far fetched. (See further Mark i. 10, 12, 29; vi. 45; viii. 10; ix. 15; xi. 3, etc.)

In the third place the practical usefulness of the hypothesis is greatly limited by the fact that it applies only to the combination *καὶ ἐὺθὺς* and not to *ἐὺθὺς* alone. At least I understand Burkitt so. And indeed if we attempt to give it the broader application we are likely to have difficulty explaining why Mark, with the Hebrew construction in mind, should have sometimes used and sometimes omitted the *καὶ*. But on the other hand to limit the application to the cases where *καὶ ἐὺθὺς* occurs is to make it entirely inapplicable to some of the cases that most need to be explained. See e.g. iv. 29; v. 2, etc. In some fifteen of its occurrences the *ἐὺθὺς* is not immediately preceded by *καὶ*.

To sum up, Mark's use of *ἐὺθὺς* is not satisfactorily explained by any theory of Semitic influence that has yet been proposed.

(2) The later interpolation theory, in turn, proves dis-

appointing when we put it to the test of practical workableness. Let us, for example, try out the proposed tests for determining which occurrences of *εὐθύς* were found in the original Mark and which were not. Merx has taught us to regard the late Syriac *mech'da*, the Latin *statim*, and the Aethiopic *sobēhā* as indications of an interpolated *εὐθύς*. It follows that where, in these several versions, a different rendering for the word is found that rendering may be taken as indicating a *εὐθύς* that is original. We have also been led to believe that the comparatively few occurrences of the word (or rather a corresponding word) in the Sinaitic Syriac have a special claim to be considered as genuine. Finally, Weiss—building on Merx's foundation and adding synoptic data to strengthen the case—gives us a definite list of seven occurrences which he regards as certainly original and three which he thinks are probably so. Now these various criteria all being parts of one proposed solution of our problem we have a right to expect that results obtained from their application would closely agree, and that in this consensus of results we should find a positive contribution to the investigation in which we are engaged. The following table, compiled from Merx's and Weiss's data, will speak for itself as to whether our expectations are realised:—

A	B	C	D	E	F	G
i. 42	i. 20	i. 12	i. 18	i. 10	i. 18	i. 18
ii. 12	i. 30	iv. 15	i. 29	i. 20	i. 20	i. 42
iii. 6	iv. 17	iv. 17	iv. 15	iv. 5	i. 42	ii. 12
iv. 5	v. 29	v. 13	iv. 17	vii. 25	iii. 6	iv. 5 *
iv. 17	v. 36	v. 29	v. 29	viii. 10	vi. 25	iv. 17
v. 42	v. 42	v. 42	v. 42		vi. 45	v. 29*
vi. 50	vi. 54	vi. 54	vi. 54		vi. 50	v. 42
vi. 54	ix. 15	ix. 15	ix. 15		vi. 54	vi. 50*
vii. 35	ix. 24	ix. 20	ix. 24		vii. 35	x. 52
ix. 15	x. 52	ix. 24	x. 52		ix. 15	xiv. 72
ix. 20	xi. 3	x. 52	xi. 3		ix. 20	
ix. 24	xv. 1	xi. 3	xv. 1		ix. 24	

*=The cases designated by Weiss as *probably* genuine.

A	B	C	D	E	F	G
xi. 2		xiv. 72			x. 52	
xiv. 45		xv. 1			xi. 2	
xiv. 72					xi. 3	
					xiv. 45	

A=LATER SYRIAC—the word rendered, but not with *mech'da*.

BCD=LATIN—the word rendered, but not with *statim*.

B=d (Latin of Codex D).

C=C (Codex Colbertinus).

D=Amiat. (Vulgate).

E=AETHIOPIC—the word rendered, but not with *sobēhā*.

F=SINAITIC SYRIAC—the word rendered.

G=Weiss's list of genuine occurrences.

If a unanimous verdict is required not a single occurrence of the word is established as genuine. Such agreement as the different lists exhibit does not seem to have any significance for the problem before us. A considerable amount of agreement was inevitable. The fact of the matter appears to be that the deeper we are drawn into this particular sort of data for the occurrences of ἐὐθύς the more hopeless we find the tangle into which we have got ourselves.

Nevertheless the defenders of the interpolation theory have performed a real service in collecting the textual evidence and presenting it in convenient form. Thus presented it is seen to be more conflicting than many of us had realised. In particular it appears that in some cases (notably with the Syriac and Latin versions) earlier witnesses differ from later in having a smaller number of the occurrences. Thus Merx's table shows that in a total of forty-three occurrences considered the Latin d omits twelve, C twenty-three, and Amiat. (Vulgate) only four. Similarly the Sinaitic Syriac omits sixteen (the number would doubtless be larger if we had the evidence of the ten cases where hiatuses occur), while the Peshitta omits only nine. This, I think, is the one definite point of importance that emerges from the data on which the interpolation theory is based.

But against the theory is the fact that while the old Latin and the old Syriac both omit a good many occurrences they do not agree, to any noteworthy extent, in the ones which they omit. Burkitt had demonstrated this in drawing up his lists referred to above. They "were originally drawn up in order to ascertain whether the Latin and the Syriac renderings showed any tendency to agree independently of the Greek, but such is not the case, even with regard to omissions" (p. 85).

I am inclined to suspect that the real reason why the earlier translators omitted a larger number of Mark's "straightways" than did their successors is to be found simply in the fact that they lived in a day when scruples about the emendation of the Gospel text had made themselves felt to a lesser extent. Why almost any translator or transcriber would feel like omitting the word here and there is easy to see. Whether, or to what extent, he actually did so would depend largely on the extent to which the text had for him a sacred character.

I should like to make one more comment, of a general character, on the interpolation theory. What could have been the motive of such interpolations? That would seem like a fair question to ask. Indeed Weiss himself asks it when reviewing Merx's theory, and proceeds to say that the answer is to be found only by supplementing text-critical data with the evidence which synoptic criticism has to offer ("Freilich hat er nicht erklärt, wie die Griechen zu dieser stylistisch so merkwürdigen Wucherung gekommen sind. Die Antwort auf diese Frage ist nicht lediglich auf dem Boden der Textkritik zu gewinnen; hier muss die textkritische Methode mit der synoptischen Kritik verbunden werden"). This looks like a promise that Weiss himself, if we follow him, will lead us to the answer which we seek.

But does he do so? I must confess my entire inability

to see that he does—or even that he makes the attempt. Whether his data do or do not point to such an interpolation as having actually been made may be open to argument. My own view, already stated, is that they do not. But as to *how* a “*stylistisch so merkwürdigen Wucherung*” could possibly be accounted for—on this he has nothing whatever to offer, as far as I can see.

It seems to me that this question must be answered, or at least squarely faced, before such a theory as that of Merx and Weiss can be taken seriously. After all the alternatives in the case are fairly simple. Either the *εὐθύς*, in each of the doubtful passages, was found in the original text of Mark or it got in later, in some way. In either case there is something to be explained. If the *εὐθύς* was in the original Mark, why did later copyists and translators leave it out? If it was not in the original, why did other copyists and translators put it in?

Now just as a matter of general probability which of these questions is the more easily answered—which explanation seems more natural? I think there can scarcely be two opinions about this. We can readily see how a transcriber or translator with even a minimum of feeling for style would be led to omit a greater or less number of the “straightways” in Mark as we know it. (We are speaking, of course, of a period when emendations were quite the common thing.) But how anyone would be led to insert them is hard to understand. To regard the usage as a personal idiosyncrasy of the author may seem far from satisfactory, yet surely it is a more probable view than that the word was inserted promiscuously by a later hand. Does not that venerable principle of textual criticism that the difficult reading is more likely to be original than the easy one still have some force?

III.

The fifty passages in which *εὐθύς* is to be found—according to more or less weighty manuscript evidence—are as follows:—i. 10, 12, 18, 20, 21, 23, 28, 29, 30, 31, 42, 43; ii. 2, 8, 12; iii. 5, 6; iv. 5, 15, 16, 17, 29; v. 2, 13, 29, 30, 36, 42*a*, 42*b*; vi. 25, 27, 45, 50, 54; vii. 25, 35; viii. 10; ix. 8, 15, 20, 24; x. 52; xi. 2, 3; xiv. 43, 45, 63, 68, 72; xv. 1. If we examine these in four of the best modern editions (Tischendorf, Westcott and Hort, von Soden, and Souter) we find that four of the occurrences are omitted by the common consent of the editors. They are iii. 5; ix. 8; xiv. 63, 68. Four others (i. 31; ii. 2; v. 13; v. 36) are omitted in T, WH, and Sou.¹ One other (vii. 35) is omitted by WH and Sou. Sod is alone in omitting the word in vii. 25. This gives us the situation as found in the best texts which modern criticism has been able to produce. The point to be clearly grasped is that there are forty or more occurrences of *εὐθύς* in Mark which must be seriously reckoned with. To weed them out of the text in wholesale fashion will not suffice.

Neither is there any ground for assuming that *εὐθύς* in Mark has a weakened sense. The evidence is all against the supposition that the word was ever used in other than its usual definite, in most occurrences temporal, force. As far as Greek literary usage is concerned this statement may be verified by consulting the standard lexicons, or better by examining the testimony of different writers for one's self. No doubt others, as well as myself, have turned hopefully to the papyri—more than half expecting to find there evidence that in popular use *εὐθύς* had lost much of its

¹ The reason for von Soden's inclusion of the word in these four occurrences apparently lies in the rôle of Villian, in the corruption of the text of the gospels, which he assigns to Tatian's *Diatessaron*. From his point of view the agreement of the "H" and "I" texts in omitting the word would be discounted by reason of its being omitted also in the *Diatessaron*.

literary force and had come to be used as a rather vague connecting particle. But such hopes seem doomed to disappointment. My own browsings in the papyri have failed to reveal a single example of such weakened use, and no example is cited in the discussion of the word in the Milligan & Moulton Vocabulary. The only uses of the word which I have been able to discover which look like even approximate parallels are to be found in the writings of some of the early Church Fathers, and these very probably have been influenced by Mark. It would be hazardous to regard them as independent witnesses, with Mark, to a trend of usage otherwise unknown.¹

If, then, we cannot get rid of the troublesome *εὐθύς*, or satisfy ourselves that it does not mean in Mark what it means elsewhere, there would appear to be only one course of action left open: we must take it as it stands and see what can be made of it. Oddly enough a detailed examination of the passages involved does not seem to have been made hitherto, i.e. an examination from other than a textual point of view.

I think it will be conducive to a better understanding of Mark's usage if we classify the forty-one occurrences found in Westcott and Hort under the following heads (I use the R.V. text, since it answers my present purpose as well as the Greek):—

1. Passages in which the use of *εὐθύς*, with its stress on *immediacy*, appears quite in keeping with the particular situation described :
 - i. 18, "And *straightway* they left their nets and followed him."
 - iii. 6, "And the Pharisees went out and *straightway* with the

¹ See e.g. *Hermas*, *Man.* xi. 12, *Vis.* v. 2, *Mar. Polyc.* vii. 2; Justin, *Dialog.* x. 4. Other interesting occurrences of the word are to be found in *Hermas*, *Man.* v. 1, 3; vi. 2, 3; *Mar. Polyc.* vi. 1, xiii. 3; Justin, *Dialog.* xcix. 1; *Apology*, xi. 11. Since the names of *Hermas*, *Justin* and *Mark* are all associated with Rome, why not explain Mark's *εὐθύς* as a Latinism? That there are other Latin locutions in the Gospel is clear enough. Why not—except that one looks in vain for the Latin archetype?

Herodians took counsel against him, how they might destroy him."

iv. 5, "And other fell on the rocky ground, where it had not much earth; and *straightway* it sprang up. . . ."

iv. 15, "And these are they by the wayside . . . and when they have heard *straightway* cometh Satan . . ."

iv. 16, "And these . . . sown upon the rocky places . . . when they have heard the word *straightway* receive it with joy . . ."

iv. 17, "and they have no root in themselves . . . then, when tribulation or persecution ariseth because of the word, *straightway* they stumble."

vi. 25, "And she [the daughter of Herodias] came in *straightway* with haste unto the king . . ."

vi. 27, "And *straightway* the king sent forth a soldier of his guard and commanded to bring his [John the Baptist's] head . . ."

vi. 50, "But he [Jesus walking on the sea] *straightway* spake with them, and sayeth unto them, Be of good cheer . . ."

ix. 24, "*Straightway* the father of the child cried out and said, I believe; help thou mine unbelief."

xi. 2, "Go your way into the village . . . and *straightway* as ye enter into it ye shall find a colt tied . . ."

xi. 3, "Say ye, The Lord hath need of him, and *straightway* he will send him back hither."

xiv. 43, "And *straightway* while he yet spake cometh Judas . . ."

xiv. 45, "And when he was come *straightway* he came to him and sayeth, Rabbi; and kissed him."

xiv. 72, "And *straightway* the second time the cock crew."

xv. 1, "And *straightway* in the morning the chief priests . . . and the whole council held a consultation, and bound Jesus . . ."

2. Passages in which the stress on immediacy is in harmony with *a priori* conceptions in the author's mind, whether it seems to us to be in keeping with the particular situation or not. There are several subheads here, as follows:—

A. The cures wrought by Jesus are instantaneous.

i. 42, "And *straightway* the leprosy departed from him . . ."

ii. 12, "And he arose and *straightway* took up the bed and went forth . . ."

v. 29, "And *straightway* the fountain of her blood was dried up . . ."

v. 42a, "And *straightway* the damsel rose up and walked . . ."

x. 52, "And *straightway* he received his sight and followed him . . ."

B. Immediate effects of one sort and another (aside from the cures) are constantly being produced on others by his deeds of power.

i. 28, "And the report of him went out *straightway* everywhere . . ."

i. 30, "Now Simon's wife's mother lay sick of a fever, and *straightway* they tell him of her."

v. 42b, "And they were amazed *straightway* with a great amazement."

vi. 54, "And . . . *straightway* the people knew him . . . and began to carry about on their beds those that were sick . . ."

vii. 25, "But *straightway* a woman whose little daughter had an unclean spirit . . . came and fell down at his feet."

ix. 15, "And *straightway* all the multitude when they saw him were greatly amazed . . ."

ix. 20, "And when he saw him *straightway* the spirit tare him grievously."

C. Jesus habitually speaks and acts with the quickness of one who realises that his mission demands haste.

i. 20, "And *straightway* he called them [James and John]."

i. 21, "And *straightway* on the Sabbath day he entered into the synagogue and taught."

i. 29, "And *straightway* . . . they came into the house of Simon and Andrew . . ."

i. 43, "And he strictly charged him, and *straightway* sent him out . . ."

ii. 8, "And *straightway* Jesus . . . sayeth unto them . . ."

v. 30, "And *straightway* Jesus . . . turned him about in the crowd and said . . ."

vi. 45, "And *straightway* he constrained his disciples to enter into the boat . . ."

viii. 10, "And *straightway* he entered into the boat with his disciples . . ."

D. Events connected with Jesus' mission (aside from Jesus' own acts) move quickly, the urgency of his mission being thus attested by the Power that guides these events.

i. 10, "And *straightway* coming up out of the water he saw the heavens rent asunder and the Spirit as a dove . . ."

i. 12, "And *straightway* the Spirit driveth him forth . . ."

i. 23, "And *straightway* . . . a man with an unclean spirit; and he cried out . . ."

v. 2, "And when he was come out of the boat, *straightway* there met him out of the tombs a man . . ."

E. The end of the present order will come suddenly.

iv. 29, "But when the fruit is ripe *straightway* he putteth forth the sickle, because the harvest is come."

The sixteen occurrences of Class I. would have attracted little attention had they stood alone. I do not mean that even in these passages the usage is to be cited as a model of

Greek style. The recurrence of the word within a few lines (as in iv. 15, 16, 17 ; vi. 25, 27 ; xi. 2, 3 ; xiv. 43, 45 ; xiv. 72 ; xv. 1) is awkward enough. But no one ever accused Mark of being a stylist. The point is that in all of these contexts the word is used where it clearly means what it is supposed to mean ; the reader does not think of questioning whether there was really occasion for its use.¹

There are twenty-five occurrences in Class II. Is it their *number* that constitutes the problem ? It is not. According to Moulton and Geden's data *τότε* occurs ninety-one times in Matthew, yet the average reader takes little notice of it and probably no one has thought of it as a problem to be solved.² But it is true that the case of *εἰθὺς* and the case of *τότε* are not one. The difference lies in the fact that Matthew's word is comparatively colourless—little more than transitional, while *εἰθὺς* is a word with a definite and positive meaning of its own. Hence *εἰθὺς* does demand explanation as *τότε* does not, but the reason is not because the occurrences are so numerous. The real reason is because in many of these twenty-five occurrences the word is used in contexts where the reader doubts its appropriateness, or questions whether what follows really happened "straightway." It is this point which we must investigate.

My suggestion is that our nearest approach to a satisfactory solution will be made when we have succeeded most fully in getting the writer's general point of view. To begin with, he was not a *littérateur*. It may be worth while to make that statement once more. The frequent repetition of a word—however good a word—may be an offence to his reader but it was not so to him. But quite aside from the

¹ This judgment might be challenged with respect to vi. 27, but I think that the use here is natural. The "king" wanted to get the disagreeable business off his mind. If he should hesitate he might relent.

² Cp. Mark's own use of *παλιν* (twenty-eight times), mentioned in the quotation from Zahn at the beginning of this article.

matter of style we must take into account what Mark's conception of the public ministry of Jesus was. As he saw it things had happened rapidly. Jesus Himself had from the first felt the *urgency* of His mission, and as time went on events had conspired to keep that thought ever before His mind. Abundant evidence may be cited in support of this statement without any reference to the frequent *εὐθύς*.

At the very beginning of Mark's account of the public work of Jesus this note of urgency appears. It is *as He is coming* up out of the baptismal water that He sees the vision of the descending Spirit and receives His call (i. 10-11), and in the next verse we read of the Spirit *driving* Him into the wilderness (i. 12). A single verse sums up the temptation experience and then comes verse 14: "Now after John was delivered up Jesus came into Galilee preaching (*κηρύσσων*) the gospel of God, and saying, The time is fulfilled (*πεπλήρωται*) and the kingdom of God is at hand (*ἤγγικεν*)."¹ The two Greek perfects and the connotations of *κηρύσσων* (cp. *κίρρυξ*, a *herald*) combine to give the reader a very distinct impression of the haste which this mission requires. This impression is heightened as one reads farther. There is a sort of breathlessness about the narrative. Events follow one another with a rapidity that would astonish us were not our minds dulled to it by familiarity. An extraordinarily large number of the incidents are said to have happened as Jesus and His party were "passing along" or "on the way" (see e.g. i. 16; ii. 14; viii. 27; ix. 9, 33; x. 17, 32, 46; xi. 20; xiii. 1). When He calls disciples He gives them no time to consider or to arrange their affairs, and those who heed the call do so without pausing to ask His credentials or to weigh His claims (i. 17, 20; ii. 14). The picture of people *running* after Jesus, or to meet Him, comes before us repeatedly. (See v. 6; vi. 33, 55; ix. 15, 25; x. 17; and note that the expression has not been taken

over by Matthew or Luke in a single one of these passages.)

Crowds throng Him wherever He goes, but this unsought popularity disturbs Him because it hinders His efforts to accomplish the work for which there is so little time (i. 35-38). In various passages this sense of the shortness of His time finds expression in the words of Jesus as quoted by Mark :-- "The days will come when the bridegroom shall be taken away from them" (ii. 20) ; "And he began to teach them that the Son of Man must suffer . . . and be killed" (viii. 31 ; cp. ix. 31). In x. 32-34 we get a vivid picture of Jesus in the lead of His band of Galileans, His face steadfastly set toward Jerusalem. The end was near, but there should be no relaxing while still there was work to do.

We have seen that *εὐθὺς* is often used in Mark to emphasise the immediate effect of Jesus' cures, but a little observation will show that the book would have conveyed very much the same impression about the cures if its vocabulary had not contained this word. Thus in the case of Simon's wife's mother we are told that "he came and took her by the hand and raised her up, and the fever left her and she ministered unto them" (i. 31). The Syrophenician woman, assured by Jesus that the demon had gone out of her daughter, went home "and found the child laid upon the bed and the demon gone out" (vii. 30). Of the deaf and dumb man it is said that at the words of Jesus "his ears were opened and the bond of his tongue was loosed and he spake plain" (vii. 35). Similarly Jesus curses the fig-tree and the next morning the disciples observe that it is "withered away from the roots" (xi. 20). It is clear that in Mark's view a mighty work performed by Jesus regularly carried with it an immediate effect.

A divinely appointed task of the greatest moment, and little time in which to accomplish it. Teachings and activities of such a character as to attract great crowds

and so make life very strenuous (cp. vi. 31, "they had no leisure so much as to eat"). Supernatural works which from their very nature produced immediate, as well as wonderful, results. These were some of the elements that went into Mark's conception of the public life of Jesus. Small wonder that in telling the story as he understood it he should have found *ἐπιθύς* a useful word.

This word may jar our sense of the fitness of things, but that after all is not sufficient ground for either eliminating or emasculating it. And it is possible that having begun by grudgingly conceding it a place in the text we may end by recommending it for special consideration to every student of the book. It "shows the vivacity of the narrator" no doubt, but it does a good deal more than that. It helps us to feel—as the earliest Gospel writer felt them—the attitude of Jesus toward His mission and the "atmosphere" surrounding Him as He worked. As Mark understood it there was assuredly nothing of the *passive* about Jesus—nothing of the *casual* about His work.

FRANK EAKIN.

THE RISE OF THE TITLE "MESSIAH."

1. THE recent article on this subject which appeared in the EXPOSITOR for January, 1923, and which came from the pen of the greatly honoured Semitic scholar, Rev. Prof. Margoliouth, of Oxford, has certainly awakened deep gratitude among all careful students of the religion of the two centuries 100 B.C. to 100 A.D. And many outside the ranks of these students will feel warm thankfulness at finding a man of such scholarship telling us something concerning the actual advent and experiences of that Man JESUS, before whose wonderful Person we bow crying out "My LORD and

my God!" That article helps us to feel how truly JESUS was one of us, the child of a human descent and not a mere transcendent stranger. He took His place among His fellows and earned His titles in beautifully human ways. When we see Him we become sure that GOD cared enough for our human state to fill into one of us so rich a personality : therefore GOD must be our Lover, and we can and must trust Him. To trust Him is surely to live in gladness. The article came to us as a chapter of the Gospel of that Son of Man who was and who is Son of GOD. We step forward breathing the faith that we can know GOD by learning ever more and more of the nature of mankind.

2. Prof. Margoliouth asks the fine question, "Whence came the name which JESUS bore, viz. 'Messiah,' i.e. 'Anointed One'?" In answer he pours all round this question a wonderful wealth of the light of learning. It may seem to some persons to be a startling proposition that it was the event of the woman's pouring an alabaster of precious nard upon His head, and on His feet, that gave at least the suggestion to His companions, if not really the cause, why they then and afterwards called Him "The Anointed One." That is only one of the fertile sources to which the Professor's article points ; but we need not recapitulate them all. We simply recommend every one to read and digest the article, quite sure that it will be well for the readers. The object of the present essay is to ask, with much diffidence and modesty and yet with earnest concern, whether Dr. Margoliouth may not agree with us that there is another source not mentioned by him which may well be counted deeply valuable, and might even be regarded as the classic source. We mean the so-called Psalms of Solomon, and especially Psalms xvii. and xviii. in that collection. Further, we may name particularly in Psalm xvii. the remarkable verses—

xvii. 1, "O IAHWEH, Thou Thyself art our KING henceforth."

Verse 23, "Behold, O IAHWEH, and raise up unto them their KING, the son of David."

Verse 35, "Yea, a righteous KING, and taught of GOD, is He over them."

Verse 36, "And there shall be no iniquity in his days in their midst :

"For all shall be devoted (holy)."

"And their KING is Anointed LORD" (i.e. He is CHRISTUS IAHWEH).

Verse 38, "IAHWEH Himself is His own KING."

Verse 51, "IAHWEH Himself is our KING for ever and ever."

All this is startling. But let us make bold to set out here two or three verses in the original Greek, for they are verily amazing :

Psalms xvii. 36*b*, runs thus--(see the English translation above) :

Πάντες ἅγιοι, καὶ βασιλεὺς αὐτῶν χριστὸς κύριος.

Verse 51*b* says :

Κύριος αὐτὸς βασιλεὺς ἡμῶν εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα καὶ ἔτι.

We may add from Psalm xviii. the title—

Ψαλμὸς τῷ Σαλομὼν ἐπὶ τοῦ χριστοῦ κυρίου,

i.e. "A Psalm for Solomon concerning the ANOINTED LORD (IAHWEH)." Also part of verse 8 :

Ὑπὸ ῥάβδον παιδείας χριστοῦ κυρίου,

i.e. "Under the rod of chastening of Anointed LORD (CHRISTUS IAHWEH)."

3. Can one be other than startled at a first discovery of these utterances! We know they were written about 60 to 50 B.C. The wonder we feel is evident also in the notes given by the learned editors of the Cambridge edition of these Psalms, Revs. H. E. Ryle and M. R. James. They say,

"In the expression 'Christos Kurios' we have perhaps the crux of the whole book." The most important matters which the notes emphasise are : first, that the Greek word *κύριος*, i.e. "LORD," stands for "IAHWEH." The explanation of this is, as many know already, that the Jews, from those years just B.C. and on until now, have felt they dare not pronounce the sacred NAME "IAHWEH." When they come to it in reading in the synagogue or elsewhere they express silent reverence and say, "Lordly One," using the Hebrew word for LORD, namely Adonai (אֲדֹנָי), the Greek equivalent of which is *κύριος*. So when we find this Greek word, say in the LXX. or elsewhere in Jewish literature, as here in these Solomonian Psalms, we know that in most cases the original Hebrew text had the word יְהוָה, and we are sure that the original Greek writer had meant "IAHWEH" by this word *κύριος*. A second important matter concerning these utterances in Solomon's Psalms xvii. f. is that the term "Christos" means "Anointed"; and it always signifies "King" or "Priest," as Dr. Margoliouth has said. A third important result of examining these utterances is that we learn that the Psalmist expected that IAHWEH Himself was to be King of the Jews.

4. This last statement is strange ; but we may get a clear idea of this expectation in the minds of the singer and his comrades if we recall the story of the events of that time, say *circa* 60 to 50 B.C. About a hundred years earlier the cruel conduct of the Syrian Overlord Antiochus IV had caused the Maccabean revolt : the result was the establishment of Independence in Judæa. In other words the throne and kingdom of David were set up again in the years 160 to 140 B.C. That kingdom had been utterly destroyed by the Babylonian royal soldier Nebuchadrezzar more than four centuries before, i.e. about 600 B.C. The restored kingdom of David now lasted in great prosperity and much

joy for a whole hundred years, from 150 to 50 B.C. Its princes, and especially Aristobulus I. reigning about 100 B.C., and those who followed him, were called kings : they were IAHWEH's Anointed ones. But then the greedy and basely governed Roman Empire seized the little land and its people. True, Rome set up the Herods as governors and they were called kings of Judæa ; but they were Edomites and therefore enemies, so by the Jews they were regarded as only slave-drivers and were despised.

Now in darkness a light shone ! Amid all this cruel ruin and disheartenment there were raised up men of faith and of song, namely such as the composers of these Psalms of (or rather " for ") Solomon ; and so likewise there sang the composers of the Book of Lamentations. Cautiously they sang, through fear of a charge of treason, for if any man of Judæa had tried to claim the throne he would have been seized and executed by the Roman rulers. Nevertheless those singers chanted that their nation should live on and abide as the kingdom of IAHWEH. And moreover they knew how the Iahwist Epic in Genesis said that their God IAHWEH had walked on earth in human form with Abraham and the fathers of old : so He could and He would walk on earth now, often unseen, and yet also visible oftentimes to His people the saints. He would be well known to them : IAHWEH should be king : IAHWEH should be the Anointed of God : IAHWEH should be the Mashiach, מָשִׁיחַ. It is notable that they did not use the term *Μέσσης*, " Messiah," as the title of the King IAHWEH. That term was not coined until the early Christians constructed it as the fittest title for their JESUS. In the Old Testament the word used was always Mashiach, and never the other term Messiach, for there was no such word as this latter in the old Hebrew language. But when the early Christians called their JESUS the ANOINTED One, they felt that they must have a far stronger Name for

Him than the old word *Mashiach*, which meant "One who has been anointed *once*," a term which had been applied to kings and priests, and even to the Persian emperor Cyrus, as Isaiah xlv. says. So those Christians created an entirely new word, which Hebrew grammarians call a "*Piel*," i.e. a frequentative expression by their well-known Semitic plan of doubling the middle consonant. By this device they said that for them JESUS WAS ANOINTED over and over, many times, constantly, and forever. They would think of Him as the eternally Anointed One. Prof. de Lagarde, the master Semitic scholar of Göttingen University thirty years ago, used to delight to point out in the class to us how those Christians worshipped JESUS by this their very form of a word.

5. But we are running too fast forward: we pause to ask how, and if possible when, the title "Anointed" or "Christus" came first to be applied to JESUS. We recapitulate, that the Psalms for Solomon show us how in the troubled days under the Roman cruelty the Psalmists and their fellowship caught the idea that they might develop the faith sung in the Biblical Psalms, especially in the little "King-Psalm-Book," Psalms xciii. 1, xcv. 3, xcvii. 1, xcviii. 6, which chanted that IAHWEH sitting in the heavens was King over all the earth. The Solomonic Psalms sing that He shall dwell in their midst, shall walk among them in human form as their CHRISTUS, their earthly ANOINTED ONE. Perhaps this was in some respects a way of evading any charge of high treason against Rome: this ANOINTED IAHWEH was not one who could be arrested — condemned. In any case now we can understand how when the birth-year of JESUS arrived there were many Jews waiting for "The Consolation of Israel," as Luke says. Surely that "Consolation" was the faith of Ps. Sol. xvii. Here was the persistence of the faith of those Solomonic singers. Of

course we might turn to the Gospels and find in them numbers of expressions of the faith that JESUS was the Christ, the Anointed One. The words of Peter are classic. But as we read these it is possible to hesitate and to fear that, in such "Gospel" records, we may be reading only the mind of Christians who lived about the dates when those Gospels were written, namely about A.D. 60 or even later. However we possess in the story of Paul "a more sure word of record" of the mind of the very earliest Christians, and of their faith.

6. The three narratives given in Luke's Book of Acts, cc. ix., xxii. and xxvi., concerning the Damascus events, may not be altogether accurate history : indeed they actually contradict each other somewhat. Yet they all agree plainly in recording certain kernel matters. First, after Paul's trance, or whatsoever physical and mental experiences he may have had, he was able to remember, and he repeats it three times, that he was aware of a Voice coming, as he judged, from heaven ; and he addressed the Speaker as "LORD." In other words, he believed that the Heavenly Person, the LORD, Kurios, Adonai, IAHWEH, was talking to him. His mind was so deeply moved that he was sure that GOD was producing certain thoughts and clear communications within him. This was not at all an unnatural experience : we all do feel at times that we are receiving inspirations, thoughts, directions from the unseen Almighty Spirit ; and we go and act decidedly on these ideas and counsels. The first central matter of moment is therefore Paul's conviction that it was IAHWEH who was speaking to him. And now the second matter of great importance is that he felt that this IAHWEH said to him, "I am JESUS, whom thou art persecuting." He became convinced that the JESUS who had so recently walked the earth and had been crucified was IAHWEH. JESUS was actually the IAHWEH whom

the Jews had been expecting to appear on earth and to be their King. Paul was a genuine Jew, trained in all the lore of his folk, and aware for a certainty of the existence of the Solomonic Psalms, with their wonderful faith and expectation ; and he must have been aware also how multitudes of his countrymen had been eagerly looking for the fulfilment of that hope. Moreover Paul's life-work for some time past had been the task of practically denying the theory that JESUS was the expected Anointed One. His whole being had been concentrated on the very question, "Are these people right?" He must have been facing that great Jewish problem, "When shall LAHWEH come and reign among us as one of ourselves?" He had been facing that solution of the problem which was accepted by those whom he had been condemning, namely their faith that JESUS was this humanly appearing LAHWEH. He had been wrestling in his soul against that idea. Now at last in his mental agony, as he travels along that road, he suddenly becomes overwhelmed with the idea, "I have been wrong. They are right. This JESUS was the Anointed One! Aye, more, He is now alive in heaven."

7. We cannot easily escape this analysis of Paul's mental experiences in that critical hour. A great theological conversion was accomplished: we need not pause to discuss its moral features: it was in any case a profoundly religious conversion. Here then we have the moment when Paul, the great maker, under God, of Christian thought, learned that JESUS was the expected KING or CHRIST LAHWEH, for whom the singers had begun to hope nearly a hundred years before. We can almost hear this remarkable and now changed Pharisee whispering to himself in echo of the old Solomonic Psalm—

"Yes, Our King is LAHWEH! He is The ANOINTED ONE come from God!

"And He has walked on earth !

"We know Him well, even I, Paul, the one time persecutor of His followers, do know ;

"We know well the tender beauty of that Person JESUS : this is the CHRISTUS !

"God sent Him to heal, to forgive, to save ; therefore God is Love !

"So now I will hasten away out to win all men to trust in Him.

"They shall trust that GOD is altogether like JESUS, and so they shall live ! "

8. In this picture of Paul's decision as to what should be his future course and his whole life's career we have been following his own statements as set down in his epistles. Many notable passages which show this have been set together by Dr. B. W. Bacon in his admirable booklet on "The Founding of The Christian Church," published by Houghton Mifflin, Cambridge, 1909. Bacon says, pp. 48 ff., that "Paul attached fundamental significance to the confession that JESUS is LORD." Paul's centrally important passages expressing this faith and Gospel are 2 Corinthians iv. 5 f. ; 1 Corinthians xii. 3 ; Romans x. 9 ; Phil. ii. 9-11. The passage first-named runs thus :

"For we preach not ourselves, but CHRIST JESUS as LORD."

We may set this in the form we have discovered to be justified, thus :

"We preach not ourselves, but the ANOINTED JESUS as IAHWEH, picture of God ! "

It is due to Dr. Bacon to say here, that he does not accept the theory that the Greek *κύριος*, i.e. LORD, meant to Paul and his followers the same as IAHWEH. Here Bacon agrees rather with the late brilliant and sorely lamented Bousset of Göttingen that in calling JESUS "LORD" they were simply attributing to Him all the royal lordliness and kingly majesty which the Greeks and the Romans attributed to their political chiefs. We must leave our

exposition given above to appeal for itself against that idea, which seems to us somewhat unworthy. In any case we find Paul henceforth proclaiming as his Gospel for all the world that JESUS was "THE ANOINTED ONE," or "The Appointed One"; also that He was and remained LORD. To Paul JESUS was IAHWEH; so he saw the utterly gracious care and love of the Great God, His devotion to His children, His forgiveness of all their sin, His constant sanctification of them, and His unfailing blessing upon them forever.

9. After such experiences of Paul and following his world-wide declaration of his message, it was perfectly natural that the Gospel writers should give much prominence to expressions of this faith, e.g. as it appears in the cry of Peter, "Thou art the Christ." The old faith of the Solomonic Psalmist had come to fulfilment. Moreover such faith took still deeper hold on their minds: they were now not satisfied to give to Him the same simple title which men of old had given to David the king, to Aaron the priest, and to their successors, and which in Isaiah xlv. 1 is given to the Persian emperor Cyrus. They coined the new name, "MESSIAH," that frequentative word which means "One who is anointed over and over, forever." He was to them the Eternal Christ!

10. Our aim is reached: we have sought to explain how and when the title "MESSIAH," "CHRIST," was given to Jesus. But it is well also to observe how easily and how surely this process of enlarging the honour given to JESUS would go forward. It was no wonder that the thinkers and scholars, often indeed somewhat childlike men as they were, entered into those intense Christological controversies concerning the Nature and the Person of JESUS, which ran along the line of the centuries and culminated in the striking expressions of the Nicene Confession, and in the more beautiful if more

perplexing poem called The Athanasian Creed. Nothing other than a great faith in the Ever-Anointed One could have continued to fascinate and to absorb the minds of busy theological thinkers even all along the ages until to-day. The exaltation of the Faith was due to Paul. The fountain of it lay in the Solomonic Psalm xvii. : " Their King shall be the Anointed IAHWEH, the Christ, the LORD."

ARCHIBALD DUFF.

WAS JEREMIAH A PRIEST ?

FOR many centuries now it has been universally assumed that Jeremiah came of a priestly family, but the only evidence for this is the phrase **מִן־הַכֹּהֲנִים**, contained in the editorial preface to Jeremiah's prophecies, chapter i. 1. The phrase itself is a peculiar one and has ever been a stumblingblock to commentators. A number of explanations have been offered to account for the expression, but none seems very satisfactory. The most generally accepted interpretation is that we have **מִן־הַכֹּהֲנִים** here rather than **הַכֹּהֵן** in order to indicate that Jeremiah, although of a priestly family, never actually officiated as priest, evidently because he belonged to the line of Abiathar, who was deposed from the priestly office by Solomon and banished to Anathoth (1 Kings ii. 26 f.).¹ But this interpretation is strained and far-fetched. It is too speculative. It deduces from **מִן־הַכֹּהֲנִים** a meaning that is surely not apparent in the phrase, and there is no evidence anywhere that Jeremiah had any connexion with the line of Abiathar. It is generally supposed that the home of Jeremiah was in Anathoth, and in Anathoth may still have lived some of the descendants of Abiathar, but the presence of the two families in the

¹ So Cornhill, *Das Buch Jeremia*, pp. xx., 2; Duhm, *Das Buch Jeremia*, pp. 2 f.; Peake, *Jeremiah (Century Bible)*, pp. 3, 79; *et al.*

same village is, of course, no proof of any blood connexion between them. A much simpler and more probable explanation of **בְּיַהֲכֶהנִים** is to see in it a marginal gloss on Anathoth, or to account for the phrase as due to the mistaken idea of the editor that Jeremiah belonged to the priests of Anathoth.

That **בְּיַהֲכֶהנִים** was not in the preface (Jer. i. 1), as it originally stood, would seem to be indicated by a number of considerations. As the text now stands, the antecedent of **אֲשֶׁר** in verse 1 is **הַכֹּהֲנִים**, whereas it is really **יְרֵמְיָהוּ**, as the Septuagint clearly indicates by its reading *ὁ κατ' ὄναλ*. Similarly in verse 2 the antecedent of **אֲשֶׁר** is not **הַכֹּהֲנִים**, as the present text would at first sight suggest, but again it is **יְרֵמְיָהוּ**. Between **אֲשֶׁר** and its antecedent has crept in the ungainly phrase **בְּיַהֲכֶהנִים**. Delete this and the text reads with perfect smoothness in both verses: "The words of Jeremiah, the son of Hilkiah, who dwelt in Anathoth, unto whom came the word of Yahweh." The phrase **בְּיַהֲכֶהנִים** is an awkward one and is without parallel in the Old Testament. Anathoth, according to the late priestly tradition, was one of the cities assigned to the priests as their possession (Josh. xxi. 18; 1 Chron. vi. 45), and some scribe who shared this tradition, seeing Anathoth in the text, instinctively set down **בְּיַהֲכֶהנִים** on the margin.² Anathoth, to his mind, was a priestly city, and Jeremiah, since he belonged to Anathoth, must necessarily have belonged to the priests there. Once the gloss got into the margin it was not long before it got into the text, and its appearance in one text got it into all the others and eventually into the Septuagint.³

² The objection that the phrase makes very poor Hebrew on the margin is easily answered by the retort that it is no better Hebrew in the text. Marginal glosses in most instances were simply notes set down by scribes as guides to the interpretation of the text. Notes need not be complete sentences and frequently are not.

³ The phrase was probably not in the earliest recensions of the LXX, else it would be difficult to account for the singular *ὁ κατ' ὄναλ* rather than the plural, following *τῶν ιερεῶν*.

The phrase מִן־הַכֹּהֲנִים would accordingly seem to be a marginal gloss due to some scribe who mistakenly believed that Jeremiah belonged to the priests of Anathoth because his home was said to have been in Anathoth. But even if this be not accepted, the idea that Jeremiah came of a priestly family has still little to support it. The statement in chapter i. 1, as all scholars agree, is secondary to the book and came from the hand of one of the compilers of the book in one of its several recensions.⁴ It is unquestionably based on the incident recorded in chapter xxxii. 6 ff., where we are told that Jeremiah purchased a field from his uncle's son, Hanamel (cf. chapter xxxvii. 12, where Jeremiah is represented as going forth to the land of Benjamin, presumably to take possession of his purchase).⁵ It is nowhere said in the writings of Jeremiah or Baruch that Jeremiah lived in Anathoth or that his home was there. Some of his family lived in the village and he bought a plot of ground there, but he himself lived and worked in Jerusalem, as we are repeatedly told throughout the book. In so far as he had any home at all, it was in Jerusalem rather than in Anathoth. His buying a field in the latter place was simply to relieve the financial distress of a relative, but this incident led the compiler to believe that his home was in Anathoth,⁶ and, since he shared the common tradition of the time that Anathoth had early been assigned to the priests, he naturally jumped to the conclusion that Jeremiah came of a priestly family. He did not quite venture, however, to call him "priest," but rather "of the priests."

⁴ For a stimulating article on the structure of Jeremiah see Robinson, *EXPOSITOR* (Eighth Series), xx. 17 ff.

⁵ The meaning of the expression לְהָלַךְ כִּיטָּה is uncertain, but הָלַךְ has clearly some connexion with Assyrian *eklu*, "field, property."

⁶ Manifestly for the same reason the redactor, who is responsible for chapter xxix. 27, speaks of Jeremiah as "Jeremiah of Anathoth." All scholars are agreed that the passage Jeremiah xxix. 24-32 is late and represents a considerable expansion of the original text.

If all of verse 1, therefore, is original to the compiler, Jeremiah's priestly connexion is simply the assumption of the compiler who lived in a period long after Jeremiah and whose statement has no other ground than the incidental connexion of Jeremiah with Anathoth and is contradicted by everything that we know of the life and personality of the prophet.

There is nothing in the oracles of Jeremiah nor in the records of his deeds to suggest that he was a priest or of priestly connexion. Indeed, there is everything to indicate the contrary. He stands at the opposite pole from Ezekiel, who we know was a priest. His attitude of mind is altogether different, as is likewise his religious emphasis. If Jeremiah and Ezekiel were both priests, we would naturally expect that of all things they would agree in their teachings on the matter of ritual and its place in religion, but it is just here that we find the chief difference between them. Ezekiel is the priest. Jeremiah is the prophet. Ezekiel's is a priestly interpretation of religion. To his mind ritual is not only important : it is essential (cf., e.g., chapter xx.), and his ideal for the state, his new Israel, is an institutionalised church (chapters xl.-xlviii.). The transgression of commands, whether ritual or moral, is sin, and both forms defile the land and are a reproach to God, who is holy. Indeed, so priestly is his attitude towards ritualistic rites and practices that he affirms that all are of God, even those that are not good : " I (Yahweh) gave them statutes that were not good and ordinances whereby they should not live " (chapter xx. 25). How vastly different was Jeremiah's interpretation of religion ! With the priestly institution he had not one whit of sympathy.⁷ To his mind the temple,

⁷ This is no new estimate of Jeremiah, but one in which all commentators have concurred, despite the fact that they have all followed unthinkingly the statement of the compiler that Jeremiah was a priest.

with all its implications, was a hindrance rather than an aid to the religious life, and its destruction was not an unwelcome prospect (chapter vii. 1-15, 21-29; xxvi. 1 ff.).⁸ In fact, so bitterly opposed to things ritualistic was he that even the Book of Deuteronomy with its modicum of ritualism was apparently not altogether acceptable to him. If chapter xi. 1 ff. has any reference to Deuteronomy, which many scholars doubt,⁹ Jeremiah did express some enthusiasm for the book when it first appeared, but more sober reflection and some experience of the law in its working seem to have convinced him of the gulf between himself and the Deuteronomic reformers. "The combination of the priestly with the prophetic standpoint, the emphasis placed on the purification of the cultus, the ruthless violence with which they carried through the policy of "thorough," were alien from his temper,"¹⁰ and it is little wonder that he clashed with those who were prone to regard the Deuteronomic code as the panacea for all the ills of the day :

How can ye say, "We are wise, and the law of Yahweh is with us"? Verily,¹¹ the lying pen of the scribes hath turned it into a lie.¹²

⁸ For a good discussion of these passages outside the commentaries, see Welch, "Jeremiah's Temple Address," *Expositor* (Eighth Series), xxii., 46 ff. In this article there is a particularly good exposition of Jeremiah's attitude toward the cultus; cf. also Skinner, *Prophecy and Religion*, pp. 170 ff.

⁹ Duhm, followed by Cornhill, regards the passage as unhistorical. Others, although accepting the narrative in part at least as genuine, feel very uncertain as to its interpretation. The passage is introduced very abruptly; "this covenant" stands without an antecedent; and it is not at all certain that the reference is to Deuteronomy. As the text now stands this is rather clearly the implication, but the passage has manifestly suffered at the hands of redactors (see, e.g., Erb, *Jeremia und seine Zeit*, pp. 138 ff.; Volz, *Studien zum Text Jeremia*, pp. 93 ff.), and, as it stood originally, there may have been no reference to Deuteronomy.

¹⁰ Peake, *Jeremiah* (*Century Bible*), p. 12.

¹¹ וְכִי is out of place after יָדָע; it is omitted by all the important versions and by some Hebrew MSS.; and so is to be deleted.

¹² Chapter viii. 8. Marti, Wellhausen, Duhm, Cornill, and many others believe that Jeremiah is here referring to Deuteronomy, but this is not certain. It is clear, however, that he is repudiating the authority of the law, and this no priest would ever have done.

To Jeremiah there was little connexion between law and real religion ; so little indeed that he denied absolutely the divine origin of any ordinances having to do with ritual : " I (Yahweh) did not address your fathers nor command them, in the day that I brought them out of the land of Egypt, in the matter of burnt-offering and sacrifice."¹³ There is doubtless something of rhetorical exaggeration in these words of Jeremiah, as in the similar words of other prophets,¹⁴ but it is very evident that he has no sympathy with the law (cf. also chapter vi. 20 ; xi. 15 ; xiv. 12). " Jeremiah was a typical ' prophet ' in his outlook, and the priestly and institutional elements of religion were for him of comparatively little importance " ;¹⁵ or, in the words of Davidson, " Jeremiah sought to draw men's minds from all that was external—sacrifices, temple, ark and lawbook—to that which was inward and real."¹⁶ His was a religion of the heart, and his ideal for the nation, quite unlike the institutionalised church of Ezekiel, was a state of society in which men's lives would be governed, not by a system of ordinances imposed from without, but by the dictates of the human heart, attuned to the will of God (chapter xxxi. 31–34 ; cf. chapters iv. 3 f. ; ix. 23 ff. ; xxii. 13 ff. ; xxiv. 7).¹⁷ Jeremiah's interpretation of religion is assuredly not

¹³ Chapter vii. 22. A good discussion of this verse is that by Welch, *EXPOSITOR* (Eighth Series), xxii., 52 ff.

¹⁴ Amos v. 21 ff. ; Hosea vi. 6 ; viii. 13 ; Isaiah i. 10 ff. ; Micah vi. 6 ff.

¹⁵ Binns, *The Book of the Prophet Jeremiah* (*Westminster Commentaries*), p. lvi.

¹⁶ *Dictionary of the Bible*, ii. 577. The passage in which the ark is referred to, chapter iii. 14–18, is now generally regarded as a late scribal gloss, although Peake would preserve verse 16 to Jeremiah, which verse, corrected by the Greek, should read : " And it shall come to pass when ye have become numerous and fruitful in the land, in those days, it is the oracle of Yahweh, men shall no more speak of the ark of the covenant of Yahweh ; it shall not come to mind, nor shall it be invoked, nor shall it be resorted to, nor shall it be made any more " (cf. Arnold, *Ephod and Ark*, pp. 72 ff.).

¹⁷ The Jeremianic origin of chapter xxxi. 31–34 has been questioned by scholars like Stade, Smend, Schmidt, and Duhm ; but has been vigorously defended by others, particularly by Cornill, *Das Buch Jeremia*, pp. 348 ff., whose arguments have been to many very convincing.

priestly nor in any way sympathetic with the priestly point of view.

We have already noted that Jeremiah purchased a field from his cousin in Anathoth (chapter xxxii. 6 ff.). This is another fact that would seem to declare the non-priestly connexion of himself and his family as well. The priests of the time manifestly held their possessions in common and had no personal property rights (cf., e.g., Deut. xviii. 1 ff.), and according to the Holiness Code, whose regulations date in the main from about the time of Jeremiah, the priests might not sell such a field as Hanamel sold to Jeremiah (see Lev. xxv. 34).

In still another way Jeremiah proclaims his non-priestly character. His language is in no sense priestly nor is his way of putting things. For example, in chapter iii. 1 we have a striking illustration of the corrupt state of the nation :

If ¹⁸ a man put away his wife, and she go from him,
And she become another man's wife, dare she return to him again? ¹⁹
Would not such a woman ²⁰ be completely polluted ?
Yet thou hast played the harlot, and wouldst return to me !
It is the oracle of Yahweh. ²¹

Here Jeremiah is not drawing his illustration from any law on divorce, as a priest would have done and as the late

¹⁸ לְאִשׁוֹ is to be omitted with 1 Hebrew MS., LXX, and Syriac. It is due to dittography on the preceding לְהָם.

¹⁹ Reading קִינְיָה אֵלֶּיךָ אִשָּׁה אֲחֵרָה with LXX, which agrees with the context as MT does not. The change arose through an effort to harmonise the text with Deuteronomy xxiv. 1-4 on the unwarranted assumption that the illustration was drawn from the Deuteronomic law on divorce.

²⁰ Reading נִטְמָא with LXX and Syriac, which agrees with the context as MT does not. Again, the change arose through an effort to harmonise the thought with Deuteronomy xxiv. 1-4.

²¹ A strophe of four lines in the dominant Jeremianic meter : 3 + 2, 2 + 3, 3 + 2, 3 - 2 beats. The וְיָהוָה אֱלֹהֵינוּ at the end is the subscription to the oracle and neither here nor elsewhere is to be taken as a part of the metrical structure of the oracle. Failure to note this has led Duhm, Cornill, and other commentators into great difficulty and many errors in the scanning of Jeremiah's poetry. Duhm also fails to note that the 2 + 3 line is simply a variant of the 3 + 2.

priestly scribe actually made him do by manipulating the text.²² He is drawing his illustration from life.²³ Is such a thing done among men ? No ! And yet Israel is doing just this thing in her relations with Yahweh. Jeremiah is human and natural in his mode of thought. There is nothing of the priest or legalist about him. Between him and the priests there was no bond of sympathy nor any point of contact. He was repudiated by them (chapters xviii. 18 ; xx. 1 ff. ; xxvi. 7 ff.), and in no less uncertain terms he repudiated them and all their devices (chapters i. 18 ; ii. 8 ; iii. 16 ; iv. 9 ; v. 30 f. ; vi. 13 ; vii. 1-28 ; viii. 8 ff. ; xiii. 13 f. ; xiv. 18 ; xix. 1 ff. ; xx. 1 ff. ; xxiii. 11, 33 f. ; xxvi. 1 ff. ; xxxiv. 18 ff.). Jeremiah was no priest nor the son of a priest.

THEOPHILE JAMES MEEK.

²² See footnotes above.

²³ Similarly in chapter iii. 19, " I would set thee among the children," i.e. " treat thee like a child," there is no reference to Hebrew law about inheritance of landed property, as Duhun and others maintain. Jeremiah is not indulging in legal subtleties, but is simply using the familiar figure of father and child to explain the love of Yahweh for Israel. On this passage see Ehrlich, *Randglossen zur Hebräischen Bibel*, iv, 246 f. ; Welch, *EXPOSITOR* (Eighth Series), xxi., 258 ff.

THE APOSTOLIC DECREE AND ITS PROBLEMS.

C. PAUL'S INFLUENCE.

It cannot be denied that in Luke's narrative of the events preceding the Apostolic Council and of the discussions at the Council itself—at least in the form in which the "Eastern" Text gives it and is printed in our critical editions—Paul plays a very subordinate rôle. From that narrative we would scarcely suspect that it was he who really was the great motive force in the whole story and that the reaction against the freedom of the Gentile Christians from the side of the Jewish element in the Church was directed in the first place against Paul personally. This is a problem which by no means affects one particular theory about author and origin of Acts, but is quite the same with any theory except perhaps one. Perhaps the "hypercritical" School, who defended the thesis that all Pauline writings are pseudepigrapha of Marcionite origin of about 125 p. Chr., would account for the mentioned fact by saying that the Catholic Church only reluctantly has accepted the authority of the "Marcionite" Apostle "Paul," and that Acts has been written in order to diminish this authority and to save the position of the (Catholic) senior Apostles. It is not very likely that this thesis has much chance of being accepted nowadays in wider circles. History is believed now to be something else than a result of deliberate forgery.

As far as I see, the facts themselves, as they took place in Antioch and in Jerusalem, fully explain and justify the subordinate rôle of Paul at least as regards the official and public deliberations. We are no doubt misled by the fact that in Galatians Paul sees himself as the *only* defender of the true Gospel of grace and freedom as for a moment he really was. As a matter of fact it was he who first saw and

who fully and frankly accepted and defended the full consequences of salvation through Christ alone. For this reason the conflict in Antioch and Galatia acquired a markedly personal character: "If any man preaches any other gospel unto you than that you have accepted (through *me*), may he be accursed." It was against him personally that the authority of the senior Apostles, though wrongly, was invoked.

In Jerusalem the senior Apostles in principle took the side of Paul, and soon also accepted the consequences of this attitude. So in Jerusalem there was fundamental agreement, and accordingly the reason for a personal prominence of Paul was taken away. On the other hand Paul was only gradually coming to that predominant standing in the Church which we unconsciously attribute to him from the very beginning of his Christian career. At the time of his first stay in Antioch, being called there by Barnabas, and of his first missionary journey, in the estimation at least of the Jerusalem Church he was a valuable assistant of Barnabas. Even for the Gentiles in Lystra (Acts xiv. 12) Barnabas was the leader. The most dangerous fact for Paul's prestige and influence and for the sake of freedom was that *even* Barnabas was carried away, and that Peter as a representative of the Jerusalem Apostles and Church stood over against Paul. This, however, can have been so only for a moment. We feel the bitterness with which Paul states this fact, but from the following events it is clear that both Barnabas and Peter soon joined Paul again and stood with him for the sake of freedom in Christ.

Nevertheless, Paul was at that moment not yet the great Apostle of the Gentiles he is in our eyes now; and the principle at stake was practically bound up so entirely with the personal attitude of Paul in Antioch and in the Asiatic Churches, that in Paul's own record of the facts his

personal part and position in the events has a far more prominent place than it had in the eyes of the Jerusalem Church. When Paul wrote to the Galatians he spoke for himself alone, and was defending his own gospel. But in Jerusalem he fell back into the second place because Peter and Barnabas decidedly took his part. And even James was easily convinced as far as the principle itself was in discussion. I do not see any objection to accept this fact which is explicitly attested by Luke. I am perfectly aware that in Jerusalem from the beginning there had been a strong tendency in favour of the strict observance of the Law and that this tendency had grown with the years, so that it narrowed gradually into a more or less sectarian reaction at the same rate as the Law lost importance in Gentile circles. But the Law had been given to the Jews, for them the obligatory observance of the Law has never been denied; it is Paul who attests that even Jesus had become a servant to the circumcision.

That, however, the Law in its full swing should be obligatory also for the Gentiles was a claim so unheard of, that the bare putting of it forward was sufficient to open the eyes of the Jerusalem Apostles to its consequences. That without the Law God had given His Spirit to the Gentile believers was a fact so notable that nobody could say anything against it. Even if we must concede that the teaching of Jesus had not yet regenerated the mind of His disciples fully (has it done so even to us?), it would have been absolutely useless if His disciples could have insisted on the fulfilment of the complete nationalist and separatist observance of the Law.

As soon as Peter and Barnabas and James had joined the cause of Paul, Paul was no longer the prominent man in the conflict. He really was the last of the Apostles, and feels himself so still in 1 Corinthians xv. 8 seq., and though God had

given him an eminent and special calling, as a matter of fact he was at the moment only in the beginning of his career.

This order of rank could not remain without influence on the place taken by Paul in the official discussions of the Council where the senior Apostles decidedly had the leading. Of course, Paul would not have hesitated for one moment to oppose, if necessary, even the senior Apostles, still, as a matter of fact, Galatians bears full witness to the real situation : Paul feels uneasy about their decision, as yet future : they are looked upon as the undisputed leaders and their authority is decisive for the Church.

A quite different question is, however, whether Paul's influence was, in fact, limited to the part he played in the public and official proceedings. A man of his character, even in the subordinate capacity as an assistant of Barnabas, could not but exercise a deep influence, especially after all which had passed in Antioch and his presence in Jerusalem must have left traces.

It is in this respect that especially the "Western" Text affords the most valuable evidence. If really this Text represents the first Lucan edition, as I think we may assume it does, we can understand perfectly that Luke in the final edition more or less effaced the personal touch, of which the first draft bears the traces.

I take the text of the "Urausgabe" just as Zahn has reconstructed it.

In Acts xv. 2 the "Western" Text adds : *ἔλεγεν γὰρ ὁ Παῦλος μένειν οὕτως καθὼς ἐπίστευσαν, διῶσχνρόμενος*. The word *διῶσχνρίζομαι* is Lucan and occurs only in Luke xxii. 59 and Acts xii. 15, in both places with the same meaning as here : "to protest emphatically." The expression *οὕτως μένειν* is Pauline (1 Cor. vii. 8, 20, 24, 40), and the thought on which the argument is based is found in Gal. iii. 26-29 : "In Christ there is no Jew nor Greek" ; Christians,

whether Jews or Greeks, are in Christ Ἀβραάμ σπέρμα. The latter words in their peculiar tendency are very important; we shall have to discuss them presently. But I lay stress on the fact that both in Galatians iii. 26 (πάντες γὰρ υἱοὶ θεοῦ ἐστε διὰ τῆς πίστεως ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ) and in Acts xv. 2 (καθὼς ἐπίστευσαν) the πίστις ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ is the decisive element in the argumentation! The thought Pauline, the form Lucan, somewhat trivial compared with the lofty ideas and manner of expression of Paul: I see no reason why we could doubt the Lucan origin of the "Western" addition.

This is one direct and explicit statement of a personal part which Paul took in the conflict, and it deserves attention that Luke in Acts xv. 2, though stating that the opposition was directed against Paul *and Barnabas*, mentions only Paul as the man who had defended the right of the Gentiles "to remain as they were" and that Luke in this way confirms the data of Galatians.

The indirect evidence, however, is much stronger still. In his book on the Apostolic Decree Resch has collected a series of parallel words and phrases in other portions of the New Testament. The result was as could be expected: words and thoughts of the Decree, especially in its "Western" form, belong to the common stock of Christian ideas and vocabulary. This is particularly the case where the Pauline Epistles are compared. This general resemblance, however, though welcome to Resch, who vindicates the authenticity of the "Western" text of the Decree (the Golden Rule and the addition of the Holy Spirit included), and though confirming the Christian character of the Decree in general, is practically irrelevant for the particular problems of the Decree themselves. That the Law is called a ζυγόν, that there is a warning against fornication and idolatry, is by no means particularly characteristic of the

special occasion at which the Decree was promulgated.

There is, however, another striking fact, which has not escaped the notice of Resch, but of which he failed to see the full consequences, being prevented by the date which he assigns to the Epistle to the Galatians. As soon as Resch comes to the Epistle to the Galatians, the parallels abound to such a degree that it cannot be accidental. Resch clings too much to the words as such, and so he finds his very numerous parallels only in the chapters v. and vi. But through the whole Epistle, and not in the words merely, but in the particular form in which the ideas and arguments occur, the affinity with some characteristic features of Acts xv. is so close, that it is impossible not to recognise that there is an essential relation which requires to be explained.

The most interesting fact, however, is that this affinity exists between a Pauline letter and ideas expressed by Peter and James in the discussion and by the official Apostolic Epistle itself. If we may assume, as I think we have a right to do, that Luke is an accurate and conscientious historiographer, this affinity can be explained only by the influence which Paul and his views exercised on the senior Apostles and on the discussions and resolutions of the whole Council. That nothing but an address of Paul in the official gathering could have had such an influence is by no means necessary. On the contrary, everybody who ever took part in meetings of this kind and in the preceding unofficial preliminaries to them, knows that it is exceptional that the really decisive element lies in the public conference; in most cases the essential part lies in the private and informal personal interviews. In this case it was only natural that Paul, though in consequence of his inferior rank not standing in the forefront at the official gatherings, had a decisive, though mediated, influence on the decisions of the Council, through his interviews with the leaders.

One thing is absolutely clear, both from Galatians and Acts, viz., that the matter in dispute lay in the realm of practical life and conduct. An objection to intercourse with Gentile, i.e. "unclean," Christians gave rise to the conflict in Antioch. The Jerusalem guests, being correct Jews, refused to eat with unclean Gentiles, even if they were Christians. Both the Pharisaic Christians and Paul explicitly draw the consequence of this refusal. The Pharisees say: "For practical conduct the Law is normative also for the Gentiles; on this condition only intercourse is admitted and possible: *ἐὰν μὴ περιτμηθῇτε καὶ τῷ ἔθει Μωσέως περιπατῇτε*" (Acts xv. 1 W.T.). Paul says: "The only normative rule is: *πνεύματι περιπατεῖτε* (Gal. v. 16). The Law is fulfilled in one word: *ἀγαπήσεις τὸν πλησίον σου ὡς σεαυτὸν*" (Gal. v. 14). Both parties agree in one fundamental point: if circumcision shall be obligatory the *whole Law* must be fulfilled. The Pharisaic Christians say that it is necessary to be circumcised *and to keep the Law* (Acts xv. 5). Paul writes: "I testify to every man that is circumcised that he is obliged to do the whole Law" (Gal. v. 3).

That circumcision should be obligatory also for the Gentiles was a *new* demand. This follows not only from the whole argument both in Galatians and in Acts, but is explicitly stated in the Apostolic Epistle (Acts xv. 24, *οἷς οὐ διεστείλαμεθα*). It is confirmed by Galatians ii. 3, where Paul says that no pressure was exercised on Titus, a Greek, to be circumcised when visiting Jerusalem with Paul. Those who have caused the conflict by putting this demand are rejected by the Council as people who *trouble* the souls of the Gentile converts, with the very same word (*ταράσσω*) which Paul uses in Galatians i. 7, speaking of the Judaic propaganda in Galatia.

The most interesting point of affinity however is found in

Peter's argument Acts xv. 8 seq. : καὶ ὁ καρδιογνώστης θεὸς ἐμαρτύρησεν αὐτοῖς δοὺς αὐτοῖς τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον καθὼς καὶ ἡμῖν, καὶ οὐδὲν διέκρινεν μεταξὺ ἡμῶν τε καὶ αὐτῶν, τῇ πίστει καθαρίσας τὰς καρδίας αὐτῶν. This argument corresponds first with the statement of Luke that Paul and Barnabas and their companions (cf. Gal. i. 1, Παῦλος ἀπόστολος . . . καὶ οἱ σὺν ἐμοὶ πάντες ἀδελφοί) everywhere on their journey from Antioch to Jerusalem narrated τὴν ἐπιστροφὴν τῶν ἐθνῶν, Acts xv. 3, and ὅσα ὁ θεὸς ἐποίησεν μετ' αὐτῶν, Acts xv. 4. But it finds its direct and exact equivalent in the question of Paul, which is sharp to the point in dispute : "Τοῦτο μόνον (this is therefore the decisive point) θέλω μαθεῖν ἀφ' ὑμῶν· ἐξ ἔργων νόμου τὸ πνεῦμα ἐλάβετε ἢ ἐξ ἀκοῆς πίστεως ;" (Gal. iii. 2). Even the form in which he puts his question shows that for him, exactly as for Peter, this point is decisive, and makes it quite probable that it was Paul who first put the whole question in this light.

There is however one slight but extremely characteristic difference, which at once throws a sharp light on the very nature of the discussions in Jerusalem : Paul writes, Galatians ii. 15 : οὐ δικαιοῦται ἄνθρωπος ἐξ ἔργων νόμου ἐὰν μὴ διὰ πίστεως. Peter uses another word : τῇ πίστει καθαρίσας τὰς καρδίας αὐτῶν, Acts xv. 9. Paul is often blamed for having introduced a juridic element into the relation between God and man by his doctrine of justification. It may be true. But here, by contrast to Peter, Paul shows that he feels and sees the relation as a *moral* one, whilst Peter, under the influence of the Jewish tradition and of the particular circumstances under which the conflict had arisen and was discussed, looks on it as a *ritual* one.

The difference is characteristic, not so much of Peter's own position, which practically will not have differed so much from Paul's, but of the whole atmosphere of the

discussions in Jerusalem which was dominated indeed by the alternative : clean or unclean.

On the other hand Paul and Peter fully agree that the Law has been unable to bring salvation : the Law is a *ζυγόν* ὃν οὔτε οἱ πατέρες ἡμῶν οὔτε ἡμεῖς ἰσχύσαμεν βαστάσαι, says Peter (Acts xv. 10) and Paul (Gal. ii. 16) : ἐξ ἔργων νόμον οὐ δικαιωθήσεται πᾶσα σὰρξ.

But also between what James says and Paul's argument in Galatians there is at least in one very important point fundamental harmony. The whole argument in Galatians especially in the chapters iii. and iv., is based upon the belief that God has chosen a *nation* to be saved. This is the ancient and innate idea of a theocracy which, for instance, had its counterpart in the idea of the *Kingdom* of God and no Christian from the Jews could think of salvation in other terms than these. It expresses what we would call the organic connection between the belief in God and the persuasion that God as a rule works along the line of the successive generations. Nor was it necessary to abandon this fundamental Israelitic idea, provided that "nation" was taken in the prophetic sense, and no longer in the legal or ritual or particularist, "carnally" nationalist sense. Paul accepts the idea in full, but takes it in the "pneumatical" sense. His whole argument in Galatians iii. and iv. tends to show that *σπέρμα* must be taken in a "pneumatical" sense : not the Jews, *σπέρματα*, plural, but Christ, *σπέρμα*, singular, is the Son of promise (Gal. iii. 16). Accordingly those are the true seed of Abraham, who are "in Christ" (iii. 29). So entirely does the idea dominate the whole argument that it culminates in the concluding words of the Epistle : "To those who shall march (*στοιχήσουσιν*, walk together at the same pace) according to this norm (of the new creation in Christ) peace be upon them and upon the *Israel of God* ; of the other (scil. Israel, those who are merely Israel according to the

flesh) let nobody trouble me ! I bear the *στίγματα Ἰησοῦ* in my body : just as these Israelites *κατὰ σάρκα* have done to Jesus they have done to me ! ”

The idea returns in the address of James referring to what Peter had said before. He states as a matter beyond dispute that God had chosen a *nation* for His name from the Gentiles, Acts xv. 14. The idea was *not* explicitly mentioned in the preceding address of Peter ; the words of James, however, prove that at the Council the problem was seen and discussed in this very typical light. It shows that the level on which from the beginning Paul had placed the problem at Antioch, “ Is Christianity national or supra-national ? ” (cf. Gal. ii. 14, 15) was also in Jerusalem the starting point of the discussions.

It is superfluous to say that Paul was not the first to put the question in this way. James was perfectly right that the prophets already had announced that God would find children for his people among the Gentiles. We may also recall the saying of John the Baptist that “ God even from the stones there could raise up children for Abraham.” And we may remember the warning given by Jesus Himself that “ many would come from east and west and would sit down with Abraham and Isaac and Jacob in the *kingdom* of heaven, but the *children* of the *kingdom* be cast out ! ” So it was not Paul’s invention that Christianity cannot be limited by national peculiarities, it was inherent to every genuine Christian preaching, only it was not so easy to perceive and to accept its consequences.

In this matter, as in so many other respects, the theory of a fundamental antithesis between the Pauline and the Palestinian Christendom (a remnant of the Tübingen theories) must be abandoned. Paul had much more in common with the Palestinian Church, from which he first had received

(1 Cor. xv. 3) the *kerugma*, than the past generation of scholars realised. But deeper than any of the others Paul had gone through the terrors of the Law, so that when he was found by Christ his salvation was to him liberation from the Law, and *nothing* but the Grace of Christ was his hope. Accordingly he, with his strong personality, accepted the alternative, so difficult for all those who had grown up under the Law: either Law or Christ. It is no wonder at all that others shrank from this dilemma. But Paul insisted. So without making Paul "the second or even the real founder" of Christian freedom, we may acknowledge that it was he indeed who, at a critical moment, saved Christianity from falling back into nationalist and sectarian narrowness. But what he really did, was bring back to the consciousness of the first believers what they did know but failed to realise.

In Jerusalem it was acknowledged that faith in Christ is the characteristic of true Christianity and that real faith is followed and crowned by the gift of the Spirit. In this connexion Peter uses a strong expression. Speaking of the gift of the Spirit, by which gift God has given witness to the Gentile brethren, he says that to demand any other condition from them is *to tempt God*: *τί πειράζετε τὸν Θεόν*; (v. 10). This once more refers to the cardinal point. After all that has been narrated by Paul and Barnabas of the blessings bestowed by God on their ministry, who could object to God? By this argument of the facts Paul has won the battle; cf. Galatians iii. 5.

There was, however, another side of the problem, and Paul was not the man to forget that. Practically there was no Christian Church existing which did not live in daily contact with Jews and Jewish Christians. The latter were bound to fulfil the Law. It could not be denied that these Chris-

tians were in a difficult situation. It is to this fact that James draws attention. "We cannot deny, nor do we wish to forget, that God has chosen a nation for his name from the Gentiles. We have no right to interfere with Him to whom are known from eternity all those things He is doing. But at the same time, since ancient times, Moses has his preachers practically in every city of importance, and the Law of Moses is read in innumerable synagogues throughout the Empire. We are not justified in forgetting this fact and in giving needless offence to all these Jews and Jewish Christians, for whom the obedience to the Law is a moral obligation. Speaking for myself, I should accordingly suggest that we do not trouble the believers from the Gentiles, but only advise them: to abstain from such things as the Jews look upon as pollutions of the idols, fornication and blood." Whether James added *πνικτόν*, or not, is unimportant, the addition would not alter the meaning. Certainly he did not mean to say that murder belonged to the daily practices of the Gentile Christians, which might offend the Jewish brethren! That, on the other hand, "fornication" was one of those things regarding which the Gentile Christians had to be trained into Christian morals, is clear as far as the Corinthians are concerned from Paul's Epistles to them, and it will certainly have been no less necessary in Syria. James mentions the outstanding features of pagan life and custom which publicly offended a Jew as pollutions. The word *ἀλισγίματα* belongs to the same sphere of ideas as the word *καθαρσίας* used by Peter and shows in which sense the three clauses are to be understood.

The three points have been accepted unanimously (Acts xv. 25), and accordingly James must have spoken in close agreement with the actual facts. It is true that Resch has argued that *πνικτόν* never belonged to the ritually forbidden

food: it will suffice to refer to Sanday's reply in *Theol. Studien Th. Zahn dargebracht*, Leipzig, 1908, p. 326 ff. And we may add that in the early Church, *πνικτόν*, as well as blood, undisputedly belongs to the forbidden things. Even if no textual tradition did contain the term *πνικτόν*, we should have to understand it as included in *αἷμα*.

Also the problem of *πορνεία* was a difficult point in the early Church, as is shown by the Epistles to the Corinthians and to the Romans. With regard to *πορνεία* it is remarkable not only that in 1 Corinthians vi. 9 *πόρνοι* and *εἰδωλολάτραι* stand in front of the long catalogue of vices and, that at the end of the quoted chapter a special pericope is dedicated to it, but that also in Galatians v. 19 *πορνεία* stands as the first in the list of *τὰ ἔργα τῆς σαρκός*.

More remarkable still is it that this occurs in an environment which in its ideals has a striking likeness to the Apostolic Epistle. "We are called to freedom, brethren," is the general tenor of the whole, but then follows the restriction that this liberty is not synonymous with carnal libidinisism. As the first inference from this general rule follows the statement that for a Christian there is another *δουλεία* than the *δουλεία* either of the Law or (what for Paul's conscience lies in the same direction) of the flesh. Christian *ἐλευθερία* is mutual *δουλεία διὰ τῆς ἀγαπῆς*. Romans xiii. 8, xv. 13 is the exact commentary of these words, and shows that Paul means to say that fraternal love in all relations is the directory of Christian conduct. Not only in Galatians, but more clearly and fully in the quoted part of Romans, Paul says that in all matters regarding differences of sentiment and customs Christian freedom must not be misused so as to give offence to the weaker brother and that both the stronger and the weaker have to respect each other mutually in Christian love.

That is exactly what the Golden Rule means. The

thought stands on a higher level with Paul; the Lucan form as a matter of fact is borrowed from a well-known proverbial expression, but the line of thought is exactly the same, and we shall not be far astray in supposing that we here also find a trace of Paul's influence, all the more as this point is indispensable the correct understanding of the preceding discussions and of the final agreement.

For Paul the principle for Christian conduct is: to be guided by the Spirit, by whom we are taught to pray, Abba, Father, Galatians iv. 6. This sonship takes the place of the sonship derived from Abraham. In this *νόθεσία* Jewish and Gentile Christians are one. But at the same time this same Spirit is also the guiding force for Christian conduct and practice: *εἰ ζῶμεν πνεύματι, πνεύματι καὶ στοιχῶμεν*. If we are *living* children of God by the Spirit, let us also by the Spirit *walk together*. Here once more the Western Text of the Apostolic Decree affords the exact parallel: *φερόμενοι ἐν τῷ ἁγίῳ πνεύματι*. Here exactly as with regard to the Golden Rule we must concede that the Pauline expressions are standing on a higher level and are pregnant with vital ideas: the pregnant *ζῶμεν* and the word *στοιχῶμεν*, which implies a walking at the same pace, as on a military march, has shrunk to a comparatively trivial exhortation to be led and driven by the Holy Spirit. Still the underlying thought is kindred to the idea expressed by Paul and is due, we may believe, to his influence.

The words in the Apostolic Epistle, *ἀνθρώποις παραδεδωκόσι τὰς ψυχὰς αὐτῶν ὑπὲρ τοῦ ὀνόματος τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν* I. X., remind us of the final words of Galatians: *ἐγὼ γὰρ τὰ στίγματα Ἰησοῦ ἐν τῷ σώματί μου βαστάζω*, and show that Paul, not only in his letter to the Galatians but also at the Council, has reminded his hearers of his sufferings for the sake of Christ. The bitter reproach that these sufferings

came from the part of the hostile Jews, has not been inserted into the Apostolic Epistle.

All this (and besides this the use of similar words and expressions which however may be taken from the general stock of the Christian vocabulary) show definitely, I should think, an intimate relation between the Apostolic Epistle and the Letter to the Galatians. The agreement is not that of a plagiarist. Both documents are entirely independent, have their own style and their particular atmosphere. The harmony is in the underlying ideas and in the line of thought. It finds its obvious and quite natural explanation in the fact that these ideas had a prominent place in the mind of the Apostle, not only when he wrote to the Galatians but also when he was present at the Council, and that they met there with a sympathetic cast of mind when he defended them.

Probably an additional reason for the influence of Pauline ideas in the Apostolic Epistle may be the following. Luke, like every ancient historian, does not transcribe the original documents verbatim, but reproduces them in his own manner, of course abridged. This may account for some of the difficulties of style in the Apostolic Epistle. But on the whole, we may regard his reproduction as a faithful résumé. Now, the apostolic Epistle according to the resolution of the Council was entrusted to be written *διὰ χειρὸς* of Judas and Silvanus. This cannot mean (as Zahn rightly remarks) that these two prominent members of the Council (*ἄνδρες ἡγούμενοι ἐν τοῖς ἀδελφοῖς*) were simply the clerks to write out a dictated letter. Apparently they had the task of reporting on the decisions of the Council in a letter to be composed by them on their own authority. When ready, it was signed by some of the leaders of the Council much in the same way as in the case of 2 Thessalonians and in similar instances. Afterwards the same men were expected to explain the letter orally. Judas, though

otherwise unknown, may be thought to have represented the Jerusalem brethren, and Silvanus, the friend and very soon the companion of Paul, the other party.

That the Apostolic Epistle breathes the Pauline spirit, may be due, in part at least, to the fact that Silvanus was one of its authors.

D. PLOOIJ.

*JEWISH EXPECTATIONS AS TO THE DATE
OF CHRIST'S COMING.*

OF all the points raised in Professor Margoliouth's paper, the most interesting is this. How comes it that the Gospels represent the Jews in our Lord's time as eagerly expecting the Messiah, when they had no such eager expectation in the earlier centuries? I do not understand the Professor to deny that the Jews before our Lord had a general expectation of the Christ, but only to say that till after the middle of the first century A.D. they did not think of His coming as imminent.

I believe that the key to the difficulty is to be found in Daniel's prophecy of the seventy weeks, Daniel ix. 24-27. If we can find out how the Jews of the first century before Christ interpreted this prophecy, we shall have light thrown on their ideas and expectations.

First, I think we may assume that, with almost all expositors, ancient and modern, they interpreted the seventy weeks to mean 490 years, a day to a year.

Second, that when they read of finishing the transgression, of making an end of sin, etc., they would connect these blessings with the coming of the Great Expected One. He and He only could make reconciliation for iniquity and bring in everlasting righteousness.

Thirdly, as to the beginning of the 490 years. In the prophecy they are dated from the commandment to restore and to build Jerusalem. As Daniel has been lamenting the desolation of Jerusalem, caused by the armies of Nebuchadnezzar, it would seem natural to interpret the commandment to restore it as meaning an edict of one of the Persian sovereigns, allowing the Jews to go to Jerusalem and live there. There are several edicts from which the 490 years might not unreasonably be dated. The earliest of these was that of Cyrus 536 B.C., and we can imagine that in 46 B.C. devout Jews would recognise that the time of Christ was now drawing near. There would be at first no certain expectation of His immediate coming, but a greater general looking forward to it. And as years passed, a more confident expectation would arise. At the same time no one would think of Herod the Great as fulfilling the prophecy. He was an Edomite and his reign, whatever its glory, could hardly be described as bringing in everlasting righteousness. The true Messiah was still to come.

But what of the first century A.D.? Professor Margoliouth admits that later in the century the Christ was eagerly expected. But was there no such expectation earlier? In A.D. 70, on any interpretation of the 490 years, the coming of Christ was not only due but overdue. He had already come and had come, as St. Paul says, "in the fulness of time."

The Christians, who fled from Jerusalem to Pella, had no doubt of this. And the Roman writers Tacitus¹ and Suetonius² bear out the contention that the Christ had been long expected. In writing of the siege of Jerusalem which ended in A.D. 70, they both refer to the belief that

¹ Tacitus, *Hist.* v. 13.

² Suetonius, *Vespasian*, 4.

at that time men coming forth from Judea should gain supremacy. They emphasise the words "eo tempore," "eo ipso tempore." But these words are not to be confined to any particular year. Suetonius calls it a *vetus opinio*, that is, an opinion that had long been held. Tacitus says it was grounded on the ancient writings of the priests, that is, on Daniel ix. Christ had indeed been expected earlier, but the feelings of the nation had not been wrought up when our Lord was on earth as they were forty years after. The tyranny of Pilate was not so bad as the cruelty of Florus. Therefore the expectation grew more and more intense as the century went on. But it had existed when our Lord lived on earth, and this is what the Gospels represent. So that without relying on the Jewish apocalyptic literature, we may conclude that the representation given in the Gospels is true and that the Jews in His lifetime were expecting the Christ.

The argument here given does not enter into the question of the date of the Book of Daniel. It only assumes, what no one denies, that the Jews of the first century B.C. possessed the Book and believed in it.

A. D. MOZLEY.

THE HISTORICAL BACKGROUND OF THE DEUTERO-ISAIAH.¹

THE documents with which these lectures are concerned cover the latter part of the sixth and the earlier part of the fifth century B.C., roughly speaking 545-445 B.C. The series of Biblical documents referred to is generally called *Deutero-Isaiah*, i.e. Isaiah xl.-lxvi., but this collection in the opinion of many recent scholars falls into two well-marked and chronologically distinct portions: (i.) the *Deutero-Isaiah* proper (Isa. xl.-lv.), which may be placed between 545 and 538 B.C., or a little after, and (ii.) the *Trito-Isaiah*. The latter evidently belongs to a subsequent time (viz. chapters lvi.-lxvi.), when the Jews had, in fair but not in considerable numbers, returned to Judæa, the temple had been rebuilt and its services continued; but the note of hope and exultant anticipation which characterises the Deutero-Isaiah had given place to one of depression and discouragement, except in Isaiah lx.-lxii., which herald a new and happier era. These last eleven chapters of Isaiah might be placed about 460-445 B.C., nearly contemporary with the age of Malachi.²

¹ [These lectures were given by the late Dr. Owen C. Whitehouse, formerly President of Cheshunt College, in the Vacation Term for Biblical Study, Newnham College, Cambridge, 1915, the year before his death. They were recently found among a number of other lectures (which have been presented to the Library of Cheshunt College), and, in view of the great interest which was taken in them at the time (as appears from numerous notes), they seem worthy of being made accessible to a wider public. Dr. Stanley Cook has been through the manuscript and made a few editorial omissions and changes.]

² These questions are discussed by Dr. Whitehouse in his commentary on Isaiah, vol. ii. (*The Century Bible*.)

It is not my business to enter into any detailed textual examination of the aforesaid chapters, and therefore and thereupon to erect an argument to prove the validity of the chronology I have set forth above. I can only say that I must postulate these results of criticism as the necessary definition of my own task, which is to describe, in illustration of those chapters, the life that formed the environment of the Jews in Western Asia and the life that pervaded Judaism itself within that century period 545-445 B.C.¹ And here I would say that sixty years ago, indeed less, a lecturer would have been provided with very inadequate materials for these lectures. But since the year 1860 the spade of the archæologist has worked on the 'tells' or mounds of rubbish that have accumulated for centuries in the valleys of the Euphrates and the Tigris; and owing to the marvellous industry and philological acumen of a series of scholars, beginning with Sir Henry Rawlinson, whom all Germans hail as 'the father of Assyriology'—just as Champollion was the father of Egyptology—and continuing through Dr. Hincks, the late Prof. Schrader and his pupil Dr. Friedrich Delitzsch, and ending with Zimmern, King, Langdon, and the Master of St. Catharine's (the late Dr. C. H. W. Johns), we are now in possession of a considerable wealth of material—of very varied cuneiform texts, historical and religious, which the learning and skill of these scholars and their collaborators have transcribed and interpreted for us.

One has only to compare any history of Israel written before 1860 with any recent history of that people, such as Kittel's, to note the enormous change which has passed over the whole treatment of Hebrew history, both in its politics, religion and institutions. The archæology of

¹ Note.—When I speak here of "environment" I shall have to deal with *foreground* to a slight extent as well as immediate *background*.

Palestine, Syria, and Asia Minor, as well as that of the Euphrates watershed, has taught us so much respecting the life and civilisation of the varied races, chiefly Semitic, in Western Asia, and the close kinship of the civilisation and ideas of some of those races to those of Israel has become so clear, that it is now impossible to treat Israel's history apart from that larger Western Asian arena of history of which it really forms a part.

It is only necessary to give a cursory glance at the map to see that this must be so. Israel did not live upon a solitary and remote island, like Iceland, but on a somewhat narrow strip of land of which the Northern part was fairly well watered, and which on its Eastern side passed gradually into desert. Palestine, therefore, became the narrow and only practicable highway of intercourse to caravans of traders that passed from North to South and also South to North, and also to the armies of the invader that assailed Egypt from Assyria or that assailed the Hittites, the Syrians, or Assyrians from Egypt. Accordingly, no nation probably was more exposed to external influences than the Philistines, Israelites, and Canaanites that lived upon the fairly fertile strip of Western Asian territory which formed this highway of nations. Nearly all these peoples had a common Semitic speech which was allied to that of their Southern neighbours in Arabia and their Northern neighbours in Aram or Syria, and even with the more distant inhabitants of the Euphrates watershed, the Assyrians and Babylonians.

Canaan and Phœnicia stood in close contact by land and also by sea with Egypt and its ancient civilisation. In addition to this we are now in full possession of the fact that from the days of Sargon of Agade and his successor Narām-Sin in the early part of the third millennium B.C., down through the reign of the great law-giver Hammurabi of Babylon, about 2100 B.C., as far as the twelfth century

and after, the whole of Western Asia, including the Hittite Kingdom, came under the all-pervading influence of Babylonian civilisation, its language, its cuneiform script, its weights and measures, its religious ideas and legends. Archaeological discovery is making this clearer every year.

(1) The startling discovery of some 500 or more tablets written in cuneiform at Tell el-Amarna in Egypt belonging to the latter part of the xviiith dynasty (1400–1370 B.C.) showed that Babylonian writing and language had spread to Canaan and Egypt. (2) Further discoveries in Canaan itself have confirmed this in a striking degree. Tablets inscribed in cuneiform and in the Babylonian language have been found by Sellin at Ta'anek (Taanach) and by Petrie at Tell el-Hesi (Lachish). (3) The code of Hammurabi found on a block of diorite eight feet high in 1901, containing 4,000 lines, has been a remarkable revelation of the influence of Babylonian law in Western Asia. That code has been translated for us by the Master of St. Catharine's in the extra volume of Hastings' Dictionary, and in his article, as well as in the late Prof. Driver's commentary on Exodus, the close parallels with Hebrew legislation (more especially the early compend of laws, the Book of the Covenant, Exod. xxi.–xxiii.), have been clearly exhibited.

Lastly, the remarkable discovery of numerous cuneiform tablets by the late Dr. Hugo Winckler at the Hittite capital Boghaz Keui in Asia Minor, and among them of the celebrated treaty, in cuneiform duplicate, of the Hittite monarch Hattusilu (Hetasar) with Rameses II of Egypt, has clearly shown that in the thirteenth and earlier centuries Babylonian language and writing was at least the official and diplomatic language of intercourse between the peoples of Western Asia, the *lingua franca* of civilisation, all these centuries earlier than the exile.

Israel, which spoke the common language of his Canaanite

neighbours, could no more escape these influences than he could avoid the light of the sun. Careful scrutiny of the Biblical records, especially of the Flood-story and the earlier chapters of Genesis, clearly demonstrates that Israel formed part of the living mass of humanity, subject to these influences and traditions which affected all alike, though in varying degrees and ways.

At this point I would anticipate a question which some might be disposed to ask : If Israel was subject to all these external influences, in what sense was Israel a 'peculiar people' separate from the other races of the world, and preserving for humanity a religion which was in a full sense redemptive ? The complete answer to this question must be reserved for a later lecture. Meanwhile, I would say this : The Old Testament itself constantly witnesses to the fact that external influences, religious, social and institutional, did very powerfully operate on Israel. These indications are the more significant because the Old Testament has been a much edited book, redacted, in fact, over and over again, with additions at different periods of Hebrew history from the seventh century onwards, and in the course of these redactions we can see evidence that elements inharmonious with the prior traditions have been omitted, modified and suppressed.

The fact is that from the days of the prophet Elijah onwards a powerful *concretive tendency* manifested itself, which reacted strongly against foreign innovations in custom and ritual. In this reaction the prophets undoubtedly were the leaders. The Nazirite order of *naẓir* was an organised attempt to stem the tide of assimilation to Canaanite traditions, especially of indulgence in wine, which characterised the vintage festival. It was an attempt to preserve the simplicity in life and in religious usage of nomadic Israel when Horeb was the mountain-sanctuary where Yahweh

dwelt. It was to Horeb that Elijah fled from the court of the Phœnician queen Jezebel. It was Amos the prophet who denounced the corruption of the Nazirites by those who tempted them to drink (ii. 11 seq.), and it was Isaiah who denounced the drunkards of Ephraim and the revellers in Jerusalem (xxviii. 1-3, 7; v. 11), and even the prophets and priests who yielded to the temptation. This strong tendency of religious conservatism to close the doors to foreign influences in religion even extended to the importation of horses (Hos. xiv. 3) and the use of chariots, and this became embodied in the Deuteronomic legislation that obviously reflects prophetic teaching and influence (Deut. xvii. 16: cf. Psal. xx. 7). From the seventh century onwards the tendency to erect these barriers in religion against foreign innovation and so preserve the integrity and purity of Hebrew religion and life became more and more marked. We find them very definitely asserted in the Book of Deuteronomy where marriages with foreigners are forbidden (vii. 3 seq.), and every form of foreign cult was rigidly suppressed, including even such approximations to it as the stone pillars and soothsaying which had been previously tolerated. Still more strict and exclusive was the post-exilic régime enforced by Ezra.

Doubtless this restrictive tendency developed into a narrow national particularism which became an animating principle of the Pharisaism of later days. But *in view of Israel's exceptionally exposed position, already described, these ramparts became in reality necessary.* In fact, the impact of foreign influences and cults upon the comparatively small Jewish community was so strong that the reforming and conservative work of Ezra and Nehemiah became a vital necessity. As Mr. Travers Herford in his suggestive book on Pharisaism very truly says: "If Ezra had not come, it is conceivable and, indeed, highly prob-

able that Judaism would have disappeared altogether.”¹

All through the history of Judaism, one might even say down to the present time, we have this constant recurrence of actions and reactions. The *actions* of the outer currents of the great world of life and ideas, to which the Jew of the Diaspora throughout all ages and countries is especially exposed, and to which his remarkable intellect is very receptive, and the *reactions* of his spiritual monotheism and Torah, that great heritage he has received from his fathers, and which he has sedulously and passionately preserved for the world's redemption, meet us continually in Jewish history. It is this constantly recurring series of actions and reactions in the history of the Jewish religion, till it emerges in Christianity, that makes it so vital, many-sided and interesting. Once again, after the Persian period, it was confronted by a very serious crisis when it came into contact with the all-pervasive Hellenism in Egypt, Syria and Asia Minor. We know how deeply this Hellenism penetrated into Jewish thought and usage. Of this the writings of Ben Sira (Ecclesiasticus), and the Wisdom of Solomon, and more especially the writings of Philo-Judæus, the pious Jew captivated by Greek philosophy, bear unmistakable evidence. We know how Greek customs, Greek gymnasia, Greek banquets, attracted and corrupted wealthy and aristocratic Jews. How far and deep the influence would have gone if it had not happened that Antiochus Epiphanes came to the throne of Syria (175 B.C.) it is difficult to say. It was the most serious crisis, perhaps, in the entire history of Judaism, and it reached its climax when Antiochus strove to enforce Greek worship on the Palestinian Jews, and suppress the religion of their fathers. This at once awakened an explosive reaction of which the great Maccabæan revolt was the immediate result, but the consequences,

¹ *Pharisaism*, p. 9.

went far beyond this. Out of the *Chasidim* or pious devotees of the law in that eventful time arose the *Pharisees*, whose devotion to Jewish religion and the Torah became a permanent element in Judaism.

As we approach the exile period we come to one of the great crises in the history of Judaism. The sixth century was such a crisis out of which the Jewish religion emerged unscathed, purified and ennobled by the sufferings which the Jewish people had endured.

Near the close of the seventh century B.C. the Assyrian power finally collapsed. The capture of its capital Nineveh took place in 606 B.C. Several causes contributed to this overthrow. Somewhere about 625 B.C. Western Asia was visited by bands of robber-hordes called Scythians, who swept over Assyria to the South-West, and visited the borders of Palestine. These were the foes "from the North" to whose devastating incursions we have several striking and vivid allusions in the earlier oracles of Jeremiah.¹ The kingdom of Judah, which was fairly protected in the central mountain ridge, does not appear to have in reality suffered severely from these desolating invaders. But with the rest of Western Asia, lying to the North-East and even the frontiers of Egypt, it was quite otherwise, if we are to trust in any degree the statements of Herodotus (i. 103-107). Assyria lay in the main track of their incursions from the shores of the Black Sea. Even the powerful race of Medes

¹ iv. 3-x. 25 contain a series of oracles delivered under apprehension of an invasion from the North (cf. i. 14 f., but here, perhaps, Babylonians may be meant). Chapter vi. certainly points clearly to the invasion of the Scythians, verses 22-26 contain a graphic portrayal. Comp. Herod. i. 103-107, who states that Cyaxares of Media, who reigned 624-585, was compelled to retire before these savage hosts and give up his projected siege of Nineveh already begun. According to chap. 105 they penetrated into Egypt, where Psamtik I. (664-610) had to buy them off. As they retired they plundered the celebrated temple of Derketo in Ashkalon. See Cornill's long note in his Commentary on Jeremiah, pp. 82-86.

were compelled to yield and to forego their attack on Nineveh owing to the incursions of the Scythians. Both Medes and Scythians came from South-east Europe and were Indo-Germanic in race. The Medes appear on the Western Asian scene earlier than the Scythians. References to the Medes may be found in Assyrian inscriptions—those of Shalmaneser III.—as far back as the ninth century B.C. The Scythians came later, though it is difficult to say when.

The Assyrians frequently attempted to conquer the Medes and even imposed tribute on them. But this was only for a time; and after the death of the last great king of Assyria, Ashurbanipal (about 626 B.C.) the power of this great military empire, exhausted by many wars, began to wane, and in the following twenty years rapidly crumbled to pieces. The shocks of Scythian incursions and the increasing power of the Median kingdom consolidated under the rule of Cyaxares, the founder of the Median empire, rapidly brought about the downfall of Assyria. In view of future events, it is necessary for us to take due note of this Indo-Germanic kingdom of the Medes, who were the real conquerors of Assyria—not the Chaldean Babylonians, who were scarcely a military people at all. The Indo-Germanic Medes were closely allied to the Persians as Indo-Germanic races, and the two names of Medes and Persians are closely blended by historians, Hebrew and Greek. Of these, more will be said later.

The downfall of the Assyrian Kingdom was watched with keen interest from the banks of the Nile, as well as the banks of the Euphrates. Eager eyes were fixed on the sick man's territory. Pharaoh Necho, in Egypt, the successor of Psamtik I., was eager to recover for Egypt the lost territory in Syria, as well as Palestine, that had been won in the great days of Thothmes III. (1470 B.C.) and Rameses II. (1250)

Accordingly, in the year 607 B.C., his armies moved into Palestine. But Babylonia was equally on the alert, and Nabopolassar, its ruler, had come to a shrewd understanding with the neighbouring and growing power of the Medes, who lived to the North-East, behind Elam, that they should divide the Assyrian Empire between them. Cyaxares was then the powerful ruler of this young and virile empire, in his capital Ecbatana (Achmetha), (634-594). The Medes were to occupy the Assyrian Empire that lay East of the Tigris; on the other hand, the lands that lay to the West from Mesopotamia onwards, were to become Babylonia's share of the spoil. This certainly seems to have been a very generous concession to the Babylonian ruler, when we remember that the capture of Nineveh in the year 606 was due to the prowess of Median and not of Babylonian warriors.¹

But this crowning event, prophesied by the prophet Nahum, had not yet taken place. Pharaoh Necho resolved to aggrandise Egypt at the expense of Assyria, and not to leave that crumbling empire to the Eastern powers only, marched his armies into Palestine, where he confronted the inadequate forces of the Kingdom of Judah, then ruled by one of its best kings, Josiah. Ancient Palestine was destined to play the same tragic rôle, owing to its geographical position, that Belgium, well named the 'cockpit of Europe,' did for more than 200 years. Palestine was quite as truly, for at least an entire millennium, 'the cockpit of Western Asia.' It was so in the days of Thothmes III. and Rameses II. It was so in the days of Sennacherib, and it was now to be so again. Josiah disputed the passage of Necho's Egyptian army, and there was a conflict at Megiddo

¹ We have this acknowledged by the last Babylonian king Nabûnaid (Nabonidus). See Winckler and Zimmern, *Keilinschr. u. das Alte Test.*, p. 105.

between his own weak forces and the larger army of the Egyptian king advancing northwards. In this battle Josiah lost his life, and with him perished all the best hopes of those who, like Jeremiah, yearned and strove for better things.

But the Egyptian army was soon to meet its match. Since the great days of Thothmes III. Egypt had never been able to withstand the armies from the Euphrates and the Tigris. Nebuchadrezzar, the son of Nabopolassar, whose death was soon approaching, hastened to the North-East to assert the power and claims of Babylonia. The shock of conflict between Egypt and Babylonia took place in the year 605 at Carchemish, where Egypt suffered total defeat in a decisive battle. Shortly after, Nebuchadrezzar hastened back to Babylon on the death of Nabopolassar whom he succeeded, and reigned from 605 to 562, the only great ruler in the short-lived Neo-Babylonian empire.

We now turn our thoughts to Judah, a tiny, apparently quite insignificant kingdom. When one turns from the Bible to the pages of Schrader's Cuneiform library (*Keilinschriftliche Bibliothek*), in several volumes, with its transcribed and translated annals, and other documents of Assyrian and Babylonian kings, one is almost oppressed with a sense of the utter insignificance of Israel. It is scarcely ever mentioned. The prominence of Hezekiah, the Jew, and of the siege of Jerusalem, in the record of the campaigns of Sennacherib, is a quite startling exception. Of course, in the light of subsequent history, we know how utterly illusory this apparent insignificance really is. It only illustrates the great saying that the "*unseen* things are eternal." Might we not convert that proposition and say that the *eternal* things are always unseen?

Not only was Judah relatively quite insignificant, but it was compelled to assume a very abject and ignoble rôle

between the great powers of the political chess board on the Nile and the Euphrates.

The death of Josiah in 607, and the deportation of his son Jehoahaz (otherwise called Shallum) to Egypt as a prisoner, put an end to all hopes of better things. The brief record of the Second Book of Kings is, fortunately for us, supplemented by the profoundly interesting and pathetic oracles of Jeremiah, and the biographic memoirs preserved for us by his faithful disciple Baruch, in the present redacted form, both in the LXX. and the Masoretic text. Jeremiah was the steadfast opponent of any connexion with, or dependence on Egypt. In this he adhered to old prophetic tradition, beginning with Hosea, and especially emphasised by Isaiah a century before, who denounced Egypt with the scornful epithet, "Rahab the vanquished," a false prop, a power upon whom there was no dependence. But there was a considerable difference between the attitude of Isaiah towards the Assyrian Empire in his day, which he sternly rebuked for its overweening arrogance (though it was acknowledged to be the rod in Yahweh's hands for Israel's chastisement), and the attitude of Jeremiah and his successor Ezekiel towards Nebuchadrezzar and the Neo-Babylonian Empire. This was so distinctly favourable, and apparently anti-patriotic, that we have to look carefully below the surface and endeavour to understand more fully the attitude of Jeremiah and his faithful martyr-disciple Uriah ben Shemaiah towards the internal life and policy of the Judæan kingdom (Jer. xxvi. 20-23).

Jehoiakim, son of Josiah, had been placed on the throne, as the mere puppet and nominee of Egypt and the pro-Egyptian party in Jerusalem, in the year 607-6 B.C. To this king and his policy, both internal and external, Jeremiah was strenuously opposed. Those deeply interesting biographical chapters, largely composed by his faithful disciple

and secretary Baruch, contained in chapters xxvi.-xlv., reveal to us the great ideas of this prophet, and the rôle he played in the last fateful days of the Judaean kingdom. Only a century before, when Judah was confronted by the growing military power of Assyria, which overshadowed Western Asia, the attitude of Isaiah towards Assyria and towards Judah was very different. It is true that he prophesied a terrible ordeal of chastisement for Judah at the hands of this great Eastern foe, but, as a result, a remnant would return or be converted to Yahweh. This was embodied in the prophetic name *Sheâr-Yāshûbh*, which Isaiah bestowed on his son. This remnant of Yahweh's faithful followers was to become the nucleus of a great hope, and this hope centred in the conception of a Messiah-ruler who would reign in righteousness, on whom the name Immanuel was bestowed. So when the great crisis of an Assyrian invasion threatened the Southern Kingdom in 701 B.C., Isaiah was full of confidence, and allayed the alarm of king and people, and declared that Jerusalem would not be captured by Sennacherib's armies. And the issue signally confirmed the prophet's inspired forecast.

But now 100 years had passed. No Messiah-ruler had arisen to rule in righteousness, but, instead, we have the long and ignoble reigns of Manasseh and Amon. The Reforms instituted by Josiah, which are reflected in the Deuteronomic legislation (621 B.C.), were only partial in their effect, and did not strike deep root, and now Josiah himself had been slain. The worship of Ashtoreth and star-deities prevailed, and Canaanite usages still held sway. Moreover, the prophet Jeremiah found himself confronted by a body of court prophets, of whom Hananiah ben Azzur was the chief representative. These were not idolaters, but regarded themselves as prophets of Yahweh, and evidently held to Isaiah's doctrine to this extent, that Jerusalem and

its temple would never be captured or destroyed. They preached smooth and comfortable things that Jerusalem would never be captured or its worship overthrown, and that Yahweh would never forsake His people. In all probability they quoted Isaiah's oracles.

Now, when we read that remarkable twenty-sixth chapter of Jeremiah, which describes Jeremiah's conflict with the court-party in the opening of Jehoiakim's reign, Jeremiah does not quote Isaiah—in fact, it is significant that he never quotes him,—but he specially quotes Isaiah's contemporary Micah or, as we probably ought to call him, Micaiah, of Moresheth. Now Micah took a quite different view of Judah's destiny.¹ At all events, towards the close of his life Isaiah was an optimist and prophesied Assyria's overthrow and Zion's deliverance; but Micah took the opposite view. The pessimist's oracle was not fulfilled then, but rather that of the prophet of hope. But in the days of Jehoiakim, Jeremiah clearly saw that the "harvest was past and the summer was ended" (viii. 20). The reforms instituted by Josiah had effected little. Old abuses die hard and are not to be uprooted by acts of parliament. "They have healed the hurt of the daughter of my people, lightly saying, 'Tis well, 'Tis well, when it is not well'" (vi. 14, viii. 11).

Jeremiah saw clearly that the end of the Judaean kingdom was rapidly approaching, and when the battle of Carchemish, in 605, made the supremacy of Babylonia more than ever certain, he was even ready to hail the advent of Babylonian rule as God's appointed destiny for Judah, to which Judah must submit.

It is certainly difficult for us in these days to reconcile

¹ Just as Micah had prophesied that Samaria should become "an heap in the field" (i. 6), so he also prophesied that Jerusalem "shall become heaps" (iii. 12, cf. i. 9).

ourselves to, or even understand, such acquiescence in the rule of a foreign despot. We have to live in the days of Jeremiah and study the conditions of the age. It was then useless to sigh for – still more useless to aspire to—the great rôle of Israel in the time of David, when it was a power to be reckoned with in Western Asia, and made other peoples tributary. Israel, i.e. the Northern Kingdom, had long vanished into captivity and obscurity. Judah only remained a very small state, which, in the circumstances, must become subject to one or the other of the great powers of Western Asia. Jehoiakim placed himself under the tutelage of Egypt, but Jeremiah saw clearly that this was a false policy, which could only end in the destruction of the Jewish kingdom. This became quite clear after the decisive battle of Carchemish. Here he was in full agreement with Isaiah, who clearly saw the impotence of Egypt. But a century had also clearly shown the internal weakness of Judah. Reformation from within was no longer possible.

Lastly, submission to Babylonia, the only other political alternative, was a very different thing from submission to Assyria, an alternative against which Isaiah had steadfastly and, as the event showed, rightly set his face. Assyria was an essentially military empire and swept over the nations whom it attacked like a desolating flood, as Isaiah describes it. But the Babylonians were by no means a military people. They were essentially agricultural and peaceful. The Babylonian was a cultivator of the soil and the land was irrigated with a vast number of canals. As the soil was naturally fertile and the population industrious, the yield in corn, palm-trees and other agricultural produce was enormous.¹ Moreover, Babylonia was a land endowed with an ancient civilisation, one where law and order had for centuries prevailed. All these facts have been disclosed

¹ See Sayce, *Social Life among the Assyrians and Babylonians*, p. 11.

to us by the vast number of tablets, many of which have been transcribed and interpreted, mostly recording deeds of sale and purchase. These documents were chiefly deposited in temples, and an important series of Temple-documents from Telloh consists, "of lists of all sorts of natural products, harvests from fields . . . lists of the fields with their cultivators, numerous receipts for loans or grants, accounts of sheep and cattle, stipends and allowances for certain people."¹

There was, therefore, much to attract in such a land where an ancient civilisation, law and order prevailed, and in which there was peace and plenty. Hence, it is not surprising that when Jerusalem was captured by Nebuchadrezzar in 597 B.C., and a large number of the inhabitants, including Ezekiel, were carried into captivity to Babylonia, Jeremiah wrote to the Jewish exiles a letter (Jer. xxix.) full of sound advice and encouragement to make the best of their position. "Build ye houses and dwell in them, and plant gardens and eat the fruit of them . . . and multiply ye there and be not diminished, and seek the peace of the city whither I have caused you to be carried away captive, and pray unto the Lord for it" (Jer. xxix. 5-7).

The last two chapters of 2 Kings, in conjunction with Jeremiah xxvi.-xlv., portray for us the closing scenes in the tragedy of the Judean kingdom. Even after the capture of Jerusalem in 597-6, when so many of the chief men of the country and 8,000 of the artisans and flower of Judah's manhood had been deported by Nebuchadrezzar's army to Babylonia, together with their king Jehoiachin (= Coniah), the unfortunate remnant that remained under the rule of the weak and vassal-king Zedekiah were still nursing their old delusions, supported by the court prophets with

¹ C. H. W. Johns, *Babylonian and Assyrian Laws, Contracts and Letters*, p. 16.

Hananiah ben Azzur at their head. The latter ventured to prophesy in the name of the Lord of Hosts that in the course of two years Nebuchadrezzar's power would be broken, and the vessels of the temple, which the Babylonian king had taken from the temple of Jerusalem, would be restored to that temple, and the captive king Jehoiachin would come back again with all his fellow-exiles. It is impossible to separate Jeremiah xxviii., where this story is told, from chapter xxvii. From chapter xxvii. we can discern the origin of Hananiah's rash prophecy. A league of Palestinian states had been formed, Tyre, Sidon, Moab, and Edom, in conjunction probably with Judah, to throw off the yoke of Nebuchadrezzar. This league was probably, if not certainly, instigated by Psamtik II., who had just ascended the throne in succession to Pharaoh Necho (593 B.C.). But once more Egypt proved a broken reed. Psamtik afforded no help to this confederacy against Nebuchadrezzar, but turned his attention in another direction—the recovery of his power in the South, i.e., in Nubia. So this conspiracy of the Palestinian states fell to pieces. Meanwhile, Zedekiah was increasingly drawn into the insidious toils of Egyptian intrigue under the reign of Psamtik II.'s successor, Pharaoh Hophra (also called Apries), who made successful raids on the Palestinian coast.

So, within five years, we again find the armies of Nebuchadrezzar set in motion against this small Palestinian state Judah, whose geographical position rendered it of considerable strategic importance to Egypt as against the Eastern powers, and to the Eastern powers as against Egypt. Ashdod, Jerusalem and Samaria were important military outposts, both to Nebuchadrezzar and to Egypt. It is not needful for our purpose to pursue further the story of these concluding episodes, graphically described in many of its features by Jeremiah's faithful secretary. This time the

Egyptian forces of Pharaoh Hophra endeavoured, though ineffectually, to intervene; but they were unable to cope with the Babylonian forces. Nebuchadrezzar was able to bring. Once more Jerusalem was captured and its unfortunate king Zedekiah was taken prisoner and brought before the king of Babylon at Riblah. Punishment of the greatest barbarity was meted out to him. Zedekiah's sons were slain before his eyes and those eyes were put out. This time the temple of Jerusalem was not spared. Both the temple and the royal palace were committed to the flames. All that was of value in its architectural splendour, as well as all the sacred vessels that had remained, were carried away to Babylon by the king's military commandant Nebuzaradan, while several of the leading priests and temple attendants were ruthlessly executed (2 Kings xxv. 6-21). One can only say of all this barbarity that it is only what the ancient records, Egyptian and Assyrian, would lead us to expect. But it is Assyrian rather than Egyptian, and it recalls the ruthlessness of Ashurnasirpal and Sargon rather than the milder traditions of Babylonia.

The ablest, and probably the worthiest of the population were once more deported to Babylonia, as their kinsmen had already been transported eleven years previously. A certain remnant succeeded in escaping to Egypt, and carried Jeremiah with them, despite his protests. Only a pitiful remnant of the agricultural population remained.

The conditions of the exile, and the effect which it produced on the Jews who lived in Babylonia, will be the subject of the next two lectures. As I have already indicated, it constituted one among the greatest and most epoch-making crises through which the Jewish people passed. The crisis constituted a *real peril* to the faith of the ordinary Jew who saw his temple destroyed, his country and its capital in the hands of a foreign people, and himself,

accompanied by many thousands of the flower of his nation's manhood, resident in the enemy's country—a land of more ancient civilisation, a well-ordered government, stately temples, with a complex and imposing system of ritual, and a polytheism august and attractive. Even the most pious Hebrew must have been tempted to exclaim : “ Hath God forgotten to be gracious, and will He be favourable no more ? ” while those whose adherence to the God of their fathers was looser would be led to conclude that Yahweh was impotent to save, and that Marduk, the chief deity of Babylonia, had shown himself to be mightier than Yahweh. It was a time of crisis for the religion of the Hebrews. How that religion survived that crisis it will be our business to ascertain.

Lastly, the exile constitutes a *great landmark* in the history and literature of the Hebrews. It left its permanent trace on the forms of their religion and on the language and style of their documents. Pre-exilian and post-exilian Hebrew—the language and style of the pre-exilian documents of the Pentateuch, J and E, as well as D, as compared with those of the post-exilian documents, embodied in P, are well marked and easily recognised. Most important of all is the contrast in the *life* of the people as it existed before and after the exile. Before the exile the people lived the normal life of an Oriental nation ruled by a king. After the exile it was ruled by a viceroy of the Persian Great King, and the people were constituted as an ecclesiastical commonwealth with the High Priest at its head ; and we shall see the continuous growth of the sacerdotal system and the increasing influence and prestige of the High Priest.

OWEN C. WHITEHOUSE.

AN EVOLUTIONIST AT CALVARY.

True Christians should be deeply concerned for the religious rights of evolutionists. A determined crusade is being waged against them. Strong attempts are being made to warn them off the premises of the Christian field as trespassers. They are denied any part or lot in Christianity. They are called on to give up one or the other, their Christian faith, or their evolutionary philosophy.

"ALL THINGS TO ALL MEN."

A serious problem is thus presented to the Christian Church, for part of its business in the world is to fit its message to all sorts of thinking. At the very beginning, Christianity showed marvellous adaptability to varying forms of thought and philosophy. This is one of the main reasons for its rapid spread. It sprang out of Judaism, but it refused to maintain a close and unmodified partnership with Hebrew ways of thinking. It was conscious of a message for all the world, and it was confident that that message could be expressed in terms of Greek philosophy no less than in terms of Old Testament thinking. A brilliant and decisive illustration is found in the Fourth Gospel. We never should have had that wonderful book, had not the writer felt the necessity and duty of restating the Christian Gospel in terms of the current philosophy of his day. The Greeks were thinking in terms of the Logos; the Hebrew idea of the Messiah meant little or nothing to them. Doubtless there were Christians of a strongly Jewish cast, who felt that it was surrendering the very essence of the Gospel to state it in other terms than in those of Messianism and Apocalypticism. But this man had the audacity and the deep Christian faith to see that the essence

of Christianity could be expressed in the terms of any philosophy which the human mind might hold seriously. So he restated the life of Jesus in terms of the Logos philosophy, thereby giving an impetus to Christian faith which it has not yet lost, and indeed never will lose.

One secret of Paul's immense success as a missionary is revealed in his own frank statement, "I am made all things to all men." When he spoke to the Jews in the synagogue of Antioch in Pisidia, he quoted from the Old Testament, in proof that Jesus was the Christ. When he spoke to the pagans at Lystra, he ignored the Old Testament, speaking only of the God who gave them rain and fruitful seasons, the God of nature whom they knew. When he spoke at Athens, he neither quoted from the Old Testament, nor spoke in terms of natural theology: he reasoned with the cultured audience, quoting from their poets, basing his presentation of Christ on their own philosophy.

CAN THE GOSPEL SPEAK IN A NEW DIALECT?

It is so that Christianity has always got forward, through exercising a faith that its essential message is capable of expression in terms of any philosophy seriously held. It is indeed a grave condition if Christianity has no adaptability to the modern mind, the mind of the evolutionist.

The question which we must face, just now, is not whether evolution is true or false, or partly true. Each must exercise his judgment in answer to that question. The Church is facing the fact that modern education is built on the hypothesis of evolution. We may outgrow evolution; but we shall grow forward, not fall backward. Must we then reduce the Christian message to a crusade against this philosophy, denying any possibility of Christian faith on the part of any one who does not definitely reject evolution? As well might we go to China with a message that there is

no hope that the Chinese may ever become Christians until they learn the English language. We indulge in no such folly; we translate our Bible into their language, our theology into the terms of their thinking. Even so must we, in sheer justice to the missionary motive, translate our Christian theology into terms intelligible to the modern mind. There is no other problem now confronting the Church more serious or immediate in its import than the problem of maintaining the real and vital connexion between the students in our colleges and the life of our Church. Somehow we must hold knowledge and religion together.

THE EVOLUTIONIST AT THE CROSS.

It has seemed, therefore, that there might be a certain value in our taking a single doctrine and seeing what it may mean to the evolutionist. What is the position of the evolutionist at Calvary? Can he, while holding heartily and strongly to his faith in evolution, find a real place at the foot of the cross, a real meaning in the sacrifice of Christ?

Of course, the meaning of Calvary to the evolutionist does not exhaust the meaning of the cross. There is vastly more to it. Through all ages, under all forms, the fact of God's redemption through Christ's sacrifice has been potent in its influence over the life and thought of man. Always the supreme matter has been, and must be, the simple presentation of the love of God, the responsibility of God, the sacrifice of God, the identification of God with man, as realised and shown in the cross of Christ. But always the grip of the cross on the soul of man will be stronger for a clear intellectual construction of it, for an understanding of it in the light of the man's necessary thinking. By what right should anyone hold that Anselm has a monopoly on

the doctrine of the Atonement? What of the centuries before he appeared? Did the cross of Christ mean nothing then? They are most true to the Gospel of Christ and to the spirit of the Living God, who insist on the right to think anew every doctrine of Christianity in the light of every new age. Why should there not be as many approaches to Calvary as there are to the New Jerusalem in the vision of John, gates on every side, so that those who come from opposite directions may meet at the centre?

Imagine, then, an evolutionist convinced, thorough-going, in his acceptance of that philosophy. He believes that all there is of life, physical and spiritual, has come about through this process of change from one form to another. What can Calvary mean to him?

DIVINE RESPONSIBILITY.

Fundamentally, to him as to all, it means that God assumes responsibility for having made a world in which sin was possible. We cannot conceive a world in which man should be morally free without the possibility of the entrance and development of sin. Calvary is the supreme proof to us that God assumes responsibility for the making of a free world.

Beyond this, what can the evolutionist see in Calvary? It is evident that certain old ways of thinking about the cross have become impossible for him. Substitutionary and forensic ideas for him have ceased to be. They have not simply changed, they have lost all reality, cast as they are in legalistic terms, and tangled as they are with what to him is an outworn cosmology. They are impossible for his uses. To him substitutionary or forensic atonement is artificial and immoral. It is unworthy of the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ.

SHADOW AND SUBSTANCE.

Moreover, clearer knowledge of the Old Testament and of the line of its development convinces the evolutionist that, on the whole, the sacrificial system of Judaism was not so much anticipatory of the coming of Christ, as it was reminiscent of the primitive rites of Canaan. To seek for the satisfying meaning of the atonement around the blood-stained altars of the Old Testament, is to him to go astray. He gladly admits that there is in the death of Christ something which satisfies that deep yearning of the human soul which found expression in sacrifice and burnt-offering, but it must mean more, or it means nothing real. He cannot admit that primitive religious practices are decisive as to the meaning of present religious thinking. What then shall Calvary mean to the evolutionist?

COSMIC SIGNIFICANCE OF THE CROSS.

For any doctrine to be intellectually satisfying, it must have a clear connexion with two great objects—the universe and the individual. That is, it must have a cosmic significance and a personal application. We must see that it means something real and positive in the life of the world, and something definite also in the experience of the individual.

Can the evolutionist see any true cosmic significance in the cross? And can he also make a clear statement to his mind of how it acts on the individual with saving power? Is there in it anything more than its moral influence, the powerful effect of a moving scene?

The very basis of all our theological thinking as Christians must be a conviction that by the deity of Jesus we mean that "God is always and everywhere like Jesus," that "what Jesus was, God is." The life and death of Jesus

mean little or nothing more than the life and death of any other man of God, if they be taken as isolated facts in history. They have meaning for theology and religion only when taken as setting forth, in one ideal and perfect setting, the essential meaning of the whole life of God and man in the world. The value of faith in the deity of Jesus is precisely here, that I see in His life what God always is, and in His death what God is always doing. Otherwise they have no vital connexion with my religion to-day.

What is there then in the life of God as the evolutionist knows Him through the study of the world in which He reveals Himself, which is represented by the atoning death of Jesus on the cross?

THE NATURE OF SIN.

There are two facts :—first, that in the light of evolution, the very essence of sin is in holding back the advancing purpose of God in the life of the world ; second, that the power which saves is the principle of the laying down of life.

Evolution reveals an “*élan vital*,” an advancing purpose of God, pushing ever on toward higher and richer realisation of the meaning of life. We see clearly, as is set forth in a little book published a few years ago, *Evolution and the Need of Atonement*, that, in this process of the world’s development, those forms, and only those forms, have entered into life, have been one with God, have carried forward the process of advancing evolution, which have held their lives cheap. Always it is the organisms that have been content with things as they are, that have set themselves athwart the advancing purpose of God, that have been the evil powers, the sinful forces and individuals. Always it has been the organisms that would risk something, would dare the dangers of the new path, that would let go of life rather

than let go of the purpose of God, that have carried forward the process of evolution to new heights.

Here then, as we watch God at work in His world, we come upon two facts, or a double fact. The first is that the very essence of sin and failure is the holding one's self apart from God's advancing purpose. That which we thus see in the life of God in the world is set forth as in no other fact or event in history in the cross of Jesus Christ. Where is the purpose of God, the loving, advancing purpose for the race, so clearly and positively seen as in Him and His ideals and Gospel? And the cross means that men set themselves against that purpose. Those in every age who will not move on with God, who hold themselves apart from God's advancing purpose, and try to retard it, are one in type with the men who nailed Christ to the cross. The nature and heinousness of sin are set forth there as in no other single incident in the life of the world as we know it. Vividly in Calvary the nature of sin is set forth as it works to-day, and has worked all through the countless ages since God began to make the world.

SACRIFICE, *v.* SURVIVAL, OF THE FITTEST.

But from the cross shines forth also in transcendent glory the principle found all through the life of the world, that life gets onward, that the world finds its salvation, through the laying down of life. As we watch God at work in His world, we catch sight of a mighty principle of His working, the very central principle of developing life; and it is that very law of sacrifice, of daring, of willingness to risk, of the laying down of the life for the good of others, which is shown most clearly in the cross. It is the law of the cross by which evolution has got forward.

Those who to-day are attacking evolution as godless and materialistic, are under a lamentable misapprehension.

They are really attacking an incomplete, out-grown idea of evolution, an attempt to explain life in terms solely of the survival of the fittest. More and more those who really think are coming to see that it is only half, and that the lesser half, of life that finds explanation in bare Darwinianism. It is many years ago that Henry Drummond pointed out in his Lowell lectures that life has come to be what it is fully as much through the working of another law, which he calls "the law of struggle for the life of others." Benjamin Kidd has given a strong restatement of that truth in his book, *The Science of Power*, in which he points out that when man comes upon the stage of the evolutionary process, another law enters which he calls the law of renunciation. I like to speak of it as the law of the *sacrifice* of the fittest, as over against the law of the *survival* of the fittest. Nor is it just to speak of this law as coming into play only with the advent of man. It reaches back through the whole process of developing life on the earth. Without this law of the sacrifice of the fittest, the mother giving herself for the life of her young, the father battling for food to maintain the brood, the wolf for the pack and the pack for the wolf, the operation of this law of the laying down of life, dim, shadowy, yet tremendously powerful, without this, life would have been extinct before man came on the scene. And with the coming of man came the chance for the glorious and full outworking of this law, the definite subordination of the law of survival to the law of sacrifice.

Here then, watching God at work in His world, we see a mighty principle at work, the very central principle of life; and it points straight to Calvary. It is a law of sacrifice, of sin-bearing, of daring, of laying down the life for the good of others. It is as clear and positive a part of the working of evolution as is the law of the survival of the fittest; we dare assert that it is even more vital and signi-

ficant than that tremendous law of the jungle. This principle of the laying down of life is also part of the law of the jungle ; and it is the part that leads straight to man, and offers itself as his best and surest guide.

How wonderful and glorious is the operation of this law in human living. Every child comes into life through a mother's pangs, and grows through the sacrifice of its parents. Truth advances by men who dare be martyrs. Civilisation gets forward through patriots who love their country or their kind more than they love life. It is at work all about us, this cosmic law of progress through the sacrifice of the fittest.

And this, which is found everywhere, comes to fullest, most dramatic, most appealing manifestation in the cross of Christ. Just as in His living we have come to see the perfect life, not something apart from common human life, but the fulfilment of all noble living ; so in His death we may and should see the perfect death, the setting forth once for all of this cosmic principle, this law on which God is always acting, this law on which God has built the world, this law of the sacrifice of the fittest.

Here, as is true elsewhere, laws that seem in conflict come to blend and harmonise. For is not the working of this law of the sacrifice of the fittest the demonstration also of the true meaning of the law of the survival of the fittest ? It is the paradox of the process of evolution, that only those who have died to help life forward have survived. We are the children and heirs not only of those who have lived, but even more of those who have died. Benjamin Kidd states the law of Darwin thus : " If A can kill B before B can kill A, then the race becomes more and more a race of A's, possessing A's qualities." But as life mounts higher, it becomes increasingly clear that another law is at work, which may be stated thus : " If A will lay down his life for B, then the

spirit of A takes possession of B, and lives on in him, and comes to dominate the race." There is atonement at work.

Is not this a doctrine that the evolutionist can preach ? Is it not a message to be eagerly proclaimed ? And has it not a clear, strong connexion with the cross of Jesus ? It uplifts that cross as the supreme forthsetting of a law on which God is always at work. It makes the cross of more and not of less effect by showing that it is the one perfect illustration of the way God works to get mankind forward.

"HE GAVE HIMSELF UP FOR ME."

So much for the cosmic significance of the atonement. What of its personal application ? In other words, how does the evolutionist find the cross of Christ possessed of saving power over the individual ?

To answer that he must define salvation. Is not this salvation, as the evolutionist defines it in its meaning for individual experience,—the realization by any individual of his highest capacities, the entering into the best and noblest possible living ? If that be salvation, then there is a clear connexion between the death of the Lord Jesus Christ and personal salvation.

Four things that death does :

First, it is the supreme manifestation, in the most dramatic and impressive form, of the principle of life and salvation as Jesus saw it.

What is life as Jesus saw it ? Not being safe, but being a saviour. Not playing safe, but playing the game. He teaches us that the value of life lies in risking it, in laying it down for a man or for a cause. Life is given us to be spent, to be given up ; we are given life in order that we may die splendidly. Some such message is central in the teaching of Jesus.

And that message He puts in unforgettable form, seals

beyond question, by taking His own life, while still young, and flinging it away ; looking death in the face, and saying, " Here is life." There, in His death, is our eternal and undying inspiration and challenge to a life that dares and sacrifices. His death proves His teaching, and His resurrection seals it.

Second, that death of Jesus, the Revealer of God, is the clearest proof that God is with us in this kind of life that is saved by losing.

God reveals Himself in a man. What sort of a man is it ? A philosopher ? An artist ? A warrior ? The revelation is many-sided, but supremely this is a man who dares stake everything for God and humanity, who takes all he has and is and offers it up. It tells us that the self-sacrificing life is the most divine life. Instinctively we call divinest that man who dies best.

" He that has lived for the lust of the minute, and died in the doing it, flesh without mind ;
He that has nailed his faith to the cross, till self died out in the love of his kind."

There is the contrast. Selfish decay, unselfish sacrifice. The stamp of divinity is on the one who dares to die.

Third, what really saves me, saves the individual, is not something which Jesus did nineteen hundred years ago. How can a past fact have present vital power ? It is not something done in the counsels of eternity, mysteriously applied to my soul and to my destiny. At least there is nothing there that the modern mind can get hold of and thereby find satisfaction. What saves me is something God does *now*, something He is always doing, something that is a part of His very nature, and has been wrought by Him into the very stuff of the world He is making. I am saved by the self-sacrifice of God now, mediated to me through parents and friends, through all who risk their lives

that my life might be better ; and Calvary is the supreme, the unique proof and forthsetting of that great principle which saves me to-day. If I see the cross rightly, I shall see Christ as Lowell sees Him, the revelation of the eternal sin-bearer, "toiling up new Calvaries ever with the cross that turns not back." It is that cross that turns not back, that cross at work to-day, which saves the men of to-day. The cross says, not "God did this once"; but "God does this all the time."

And fourth, the cross saves me by calling me into a fellowship of sacrifice and service. It is salvation, of the highest and finest sort, to be led into self-forgetfulness, through absorbing interest in a great person or a great cause. Dr. Ernest D. Burton once said to me that so far as he knew there is not a reference to the cross in the entire New Testament which does not view it as meant for the disciple as truly as for the Master. It is when the cross becomes a vital principle in *me* that I am saved by it.

"The cross on Golgotha can never save thy soul ;

The cross in thine own heart alone can make thee whole."

The evolutionist can even talk gladly of the "blood of Christ" and its saving power ; only he no longer thinks of fountains, or of cleansing by washing. He thinks of how blood cleanses to-day. I know a little girl who has had again and again to have her blood cleansed by transfusion, whereby her thin, diseased blood has been replaced by vigorous, healthy blood. And she is coming back to life and vigour again. It is so that men may think to-day of the cleansing power of the blood of Christ, the Son of God. It is the life of God that enters us through Christ that cleanses us, not any external washing. We get the full power of the cross of Christ only when we say, with the Apostle, "He laid down His life for us, and we ought to lay down our lives for the brethren." To enter into that

spirit is not simply a result of salvation through the atonement of Christ ; it *is* salvation, it is entering into life through the working of God's atoning spirit, that eternal spirit through which Jesus offered Himself, and in which God and man, God in man, is ever offering Him self, for the life and salvation of the world.

The evolutionist has a place at the foot of the cross. It may be a little place, a humble place. Others may press nearer, and see more deeply into the mystery of the divine sacrifice whereby mankind is being saved. But, along his own way, the evolutionist may come to Calvary, and find there a significance and a glory which he alone can fully appreciate. The cross may be to him the symbol and pledge of that "one far-off, divine event to which the whole creation moves," the supreme and heart-satisfying revelation in one scene of the ceaseless working of those "hands that reach through nature, moulding men."

WILLIAM PIERSON MERRILL.

A ZEALOT PAMPHLET.

AMONG the varied materials which make up the Book of Enoch is included a minor apocalypse, commonly called the Apocalypse of Weeks. As it bears a very definite character, it can easily be separated from its surroundings and studied by itself. Before turning to its contents, however, it deserves notice that the document was not admitted among the Enoch literature, until it had received two slight changes. First, it was cut into two, and the two sections into which it was divided were violently separated from one another. They appear now as xciii. 1-10 and xci. 12-17. Thanks to the distinct character which the little apocalypse bears, everyone can recognise the continuity of the document, as soon as its two parts are brought together. But, second, xciii. 1-10, besides being separated from its continuation, has been supplemented by the addition of four verses, xciii. 11-14. This little intruded section is patently an addition, since it is not only in direct opposition to the close of the passage to which it has been added, but is in disagreement with a fundamental position of the entire Book of Enoch.

The apocalypse in its original form offers a sketch of the history of the world from the creation to the final consummation. The entire period has been divided into ten weeks—hence the title, the Apocalypse of Weeks. The writer begins by indicating for whose benefit or in whose interest his review of world-history is intended. For Enoch is represented as revealing the course of history from the beginning to the end, as it concerns “the children of righteousness,” and “the elect of the world,” and “the plant of uprightness.” That is to say, through his historical review the writer chiefly intends to point out the

events which led to the origin of that community in whose fate he is peculiarly interested, and to predict in the future what God has in store for them in the consummation.

Now the triple description which is given of this party has the appearance of being a conflate reading, and may well be so. If it is, the title which must be retained as original is "the elect of the world," for this title is unique in the entire Enoch literature. No glossator would have felt it necessary to explain a current title by adding an otherwise unknown phrase: he might gloss a unique title by adding one which was current. There is, however, no need to suppose a conflate reading. For it is natural to suppose that the writer used a title, "the elect of the world," which was familiar to himself and to the circle for whom he was writing, and when he added to this "the children of righteousness" and "the plant of uprightness," he meant to say that these were synonymous with, or were only to be found among "the elect of the world." Already one feels the atmosphere of the sect. These have always loved esoteric names, and have claimed for a little company the privileges and titles of the larger community.

The writer then proceeds to unfold his view of world-history. The first age or week is naturally that in which Enoch himself lived, and is described as one in which "judgment and righteousness still endured," verse 3. That this implies an initial age of innocence is more clearly shown by the contrast drawn between it and the second age, in which "great wickedness and deceit spring up," verse 4. The second age is undoubtedly that of the flood, since "in it shall be the first end," and "a man shall be saved." In this attitude to the first age the writer is in close agreement with the general view in the Enoch literature. Like many of its writers, he ignores the story of the fall of Adam, regards the period before the

flood as an innocent age, and, basing on the tradition in Genesis c. 6, which relates the intercourse of the sons of God with the daughters of men, ascribes the corruption of the world to the fall of the angels or angel watchers. The flood then becomes the first end, the first intervention by God in judgment. But, how sharply legalistic the writer's attitude is, manifests itself by the meagre content he extracts from the noble chapters in Genesis which relate the flood. There the issue of the judgment is God's covenant with mankind. His gracious promise that, in view of human weakness, He will set limitations to His just anger lest the issue be the utter destruction of His world. All the flood contributes to the world in our document is one saved man and a law for sinners.

The third age introduces Abraham, describing him as the "plant of righteous judgment" and his posterity as "the plant of righteousness for evermore," verse 5. Evidently, then, the "children of righteousness," and the "plant of uprightness" of verse 2, are Israel, whatever the "elect of the world" may be.

The fourth age introduces Moses with a law for all generations and an enclosure, verse 6. The enclosure is capable of, and has received various interpretations. It may mean Palestine, in which case the age closes with the settlement of Israel, possessed of its new law, in the new land. It may also mean the tabernacle. More probably the latter is intended. For the distinguishing feature of the fifth age is the building of the temple, verse 7: and it may well be felt that the period between the conquest of Palestine and the erection of Solomon's temple is briefer than the time the writer generally allows to each successive age. What inclines me more to this position, however, is the primary and commanding interest of the writer in law

and temple, as the factors in Israel which make up its specific life and constitute it the plant of uprightness. When he was thinking of Moses, he was likely to represent him as having introduced the first torah, and given the plan for the final temple.

The sixth age sees the people become corrupt, with the result that, as a punishment for their sins, the temple is burned and the entire race of the chosen root dispersed, verse 8. Both terms of the description point unmistakably to the final captivity of Judah under Nebuchadrezzar.

So far there is nothing very noteworthy in the writer's view. His sketch of history runs along familiar lines, though he develops it in a severely legalistic and somewhat barren method. God's gifts to His world are a reaction of His anger against its first sin and a law for the sinners. God's gifts to His chosen race are an eternal law to keep and a temple in which to offer its service. What constitutes Israel the plant of uprightness is that it keeps this law and worships in this temple. When it fails in one direction or another, God reacts against it for condemnation. Life and duty have the hard, sharp, glaring clarity which belongs to such a view. Again we are conscious of breathing the atmosphere of a sect, the heavy air of a walled-in garden, not the wind from off the hills.

It is when he reaches the seventh age that the writer moves away from traditional opinions and begins to develop the peculiar attitude of himself and his associates. And a very startling view it is. For what he says about it is that in this age an apostate generation shall arise, and many shall be its deeds, and all its deeds shall be apostate. To what period is he referring? The general explanation is that he refers to the diaspora, and that he condemns all the worship offered by that generation as worthless. This, it is added, he could not but do, since to his severely

legalistic mind every act of worship, which was not offered in the holy city and at the temple, was *ipso facto* invalid. But there are two considerations which seem to render such an explanation impossible. In the first place, if by the seventh age he means the age of the diaspora, he never refers to the return from exile at all. Yet, on the very principles on which he may naturally be supposed, and has been supposed to condemn the entire diaspora, the reconstitution of the worship and of obedience to the law at Jerusalem was the cardinal point in the later history of Israel. Without it all the previous election of the chosen race threatened to come to nothing. To any Jew it was difficult not to make some reference to the event which renewed the life of the people, but in a Jew of this temper it is inexplicable. But with the eighth age the apocalyptist begins to describe the consummation which then pursues its course through the three concluding ages. That is to say, his scheme had no place for the return under Nehemiah. And, in the second place, his attitude to the return is not unique, however unusual it may be. Another apocalyptist, whose work has been incorporated into the Book of Enoch at chapter lxxxix., describes the period which follows the dispersion in verses 73-75. He undoubtedly refers to the return from exile, for he makes one of his world-ages the period in which the temple was restored. And what he says about this period is that "they reared up that tower (by which he means the temple) and it was named the high tower, and they began again to place a table before that tower, but all the bread on it was polluted and not pure." To refer to certain expressions which the prophet Malachi employs about the worship of the second temple, such as i. 7, does not explain such an indictment. The prophet does say that the bread was polluted because of certain imperfections in the worship

at one particular period after the return or because of some temporary laxity on the part of the worshippers. But no one has ever suggested that Malachi condemned the entire worship of the second temple. Yet what the phrase in lxxxix. 73 implies is, not that at certain periods there were failures in the worship after the return, but that there was some taint in the second temple which rendered all the worship offered in it worthless. Our apocalyptist takes the same attitude, and utters the same sweeping verdict on the effort of the same generation, "all its deeds shall be apostate." The only meaning of such a denunciation, especially when it is found twice, and when it comes from men who valued their torah and their cult, is that we have to recognise a body of opinion in late Judaism, which, for one reason or another, rejected the whole work of the restoration period as tainted and evil. Neither writer gives any reason for advancing such an opinion, probably because it was so well known to, and recognised in, the circle of thought for which he was writing that it was needless to specify it.

What serves to make matters even more clear is that to the close of this period the writer assigns the origin of his own peculiar sect. "At its close shall be elected the elect righteous of the eternal plant of righteousness," verse 10. These are the men who count all the work of their immediate predecessors apostate. And these are not Israel, they are an election from the elect race, who have separated themselves now. While Israel pursues its task at the restoration, ignorant that all its labour is worse than wasted, the possessors of a special knowledge, who "receive seven-fold instruction concerning all God's creation," have constituted themselves apart to fulfil a worthy task. Now we know who were the men for whom the writer planned and wrote his entire apocalypse. These are the "elect of

the world " of verse 2, who are the real plant of uprightness. For them, to describe their origin, to define their position, and to encourage them in their task he wrote his sketch of the world's history.

Having sketched when and how they came to be constituted the chosen from among the chosen, the writer turns to describe their fate and their future in the verses xci. 12-17, which have been torn away from their original setting. It is wise to ignore rigidly the intruded verses, xciii. 11-14, and to read the close of the apocalypse in close connexion with that from which it was separated. The eighth age is to see the dawn of the consummation, which fulfils itself in three great acts. The primary characteristic of the first is that the elect shall have the sword put into their hands with which they shall break down their oppressors. They already possess sevenfold instruction concerning all God's creation: all they now need is to have power as they already possess truth. Their first use of the power which is given them is to free themselves and their land from those who at present restrain them. When, through the sword of the Lord, they have won liberty and dominion in their own land, they shall build their city and their temple. It shall be the true temple, since it shall stand in a land free from all heathen domination and among a people able to determine their lives after the demands of their own law.

Thereafter, in the ninth age, every benefit for the world shall flow out from this pure centre, which is now able to diffuse its influence on every side, verse 14. I see no compelling reason with Dr. Charles to change anything in the order of these clauses. As judgment was done in Palestine, when once the elect were equipped with the power which was their due, so now judgment shall be done in all the world by those who hold sevenfold instruction.

Their power shall have its full, its just scope. The world—and the world here is that undefined and undefinable world of every little sect, viz., everything which fails to conform to their position—the world shall be written down for destruction. And when they have destroyed whatever sets itself up against their dominion, all mankind shall look to the path of righteousness, that strait path, which has first been triumphantly vindicated in Palestine, which was set up in the sight of man when the temple at Jerusalem was built, which has now been finally vindicated through its victory over the world.

That is the programme of a sect, which is so entirely convinced of its possession of the truth that it cannot even conceive it possible that the day of the Lord's judgment may first bring judgment to its own door. What the world needs is that God should give the elect power as He has already given them the truth. When He does, there will be a new earth.

After this, the tenth age finds nothing to set right except the angels who brought the first apostasy among men, but who are beyond the reach of the elect of the world. Accordingly God shall judge the angels, and through His judgment of them make a new heaven, verses 15, 16. But as for the earth, it does not need His renewal. He has committed its renewal to the elect. When they receive power from the Almighty, they set right His earth, and leave Him to set right His heaven.

The omissions in this remarkable and consistent programme are as noteworthy as the things which are included. There is no Messiah, because there is no room as there is no need for Him. Isaiah expected a Messiah with a sevenfold endowment to bless both Israel and the world with His gifts. But God's anointed is already on earth in this body of men which has received sevenfold instruction con-

cerning all God's creation. What more can even Messiah bring? There is no Messianic kingdom in the older prophetic sense of the term—a kingdom governed by One who constitutes and maintains it on the basis of the divine standards. The divine standards already control the life and guide the aims of the elect. All that the world needs is that the elect should receive power to enforce their principles. When they have received from God through the gift of the sword their due place, they shall re-make the world. Hence God makes no new earth. Only, since the power of man cannot reach so far as to renew heaven, this is relegated to the Almighty. There is also no thought or mention of resurrection. For the resurrection in old Israel was essentially a religious question, and this is a political programme which makes religion its helper. The men who wrote apocalypses along religious lines could never forget the righteous dead who had died in faith of a coming kingdom which they were never to see. God was to set up a kingdom which was to be His kingdom and which must therefore find room for all who were His. But the men who expected a kingdom which they were able to set up themselves could be content with a kingdom which only included themselves and their like.

If we so interpret the entire apocalypse and recognise it as a consistent whole, it becomes easier to understand why, before it could be included in the Book of Enoch, it was not left in its integrity, but was cut into two and had a few verses interpolated. It becomes also possible to explain the remarkable nature of the interpolation.

When the apocalypse was included among other Enochic material, it was cut off precisely where its sectarian character became peculiarly patent and offensive to the main body of Jewish thought. It was intolerable to read that the sword of the Lord was to be delivered over to a little

Puritanic sect in order to make its inordinate claims and peculiar convictions effective. Hence the second half, which said precisely this thing, was placed in a new position immediately after xci. 11, where it was robbed of its sting. For there too it was said that, when the judgment of an evil world came to fruition, sinners were to be destroyed by the sword.¹ To insert the new section here, where it was separated from its connexion, made it entirely harmless, because, read here, it did not definitely declare to whom the sword of judgment was to be committed. Now it was not the idea of giving the sword, but the definition of those who were to receive it, which was the offence. So long as it remained vague as to who should wield that sword, it was made possible to think of it as the sword of Yahweh in His hands, and to see in the verses a vivid description of His swift and ruthless action against all evildoers. Or, even if it were interpreted as put into the hands of Israel, that too was tolerable. What was intolerable was that a mere sect within Israel should be represented as being entrusted with such power.

Not content, however, with dislocating the apocalypse and so helping to turn its edge, the man who included it in Enoch added the verses xciii. 11-14. And these are so remarkable in their tenor that they need to be quoted in full. "For who is there of all the children of men that is able to hear the voice of the Holy One without being troubled? And who can think His thoughts? And who is there that can behold all the works of heaven? And

¹ Dr. Charles regards this verse, xci. 11, as the stitch, supplied by the editor in order to make the necessary point of transition from the earlier section to the included verses. I prefer to regard that verse as original and as supplying the reason why the transferred section came to rest where it does. Dr. Charles' view fails, I think, to explain why any one put the transferred section at the close of chapter xci. My suggestion at least attempts to meet this relevant question.

how should there be one who could behold the heaven, and who is there that could understand the things of heaven and see a soul or a spirit and could tell thereof, or ascend and see all their ends and think them or do like them ? And who is there of all men that could know what is the breadth and the length of the earth, and to whom has been shown the measure of all of them ? Or is there any one who could discuss the length of the heaven and how great is its height, and upon what it is founded, and how great is the number of the stars, and where all the luminaries rest ? ”

Everyone must recognise how entirely the verses are out of place, where they occur. But Dr. Charles thinks that, while they do not suit their present position, they are more in place as part of the book of the heavenly luminaries, chapters lxxii.-lxxix., lxxxii. In reality the verses suit the book of the heavenly luminaries as badly as they suit here. Indeed they suit that book worse than they suit here, because they contradict its fundamental position more flagrantly. They suit nowhere in all the Enochic literature, for they deliberately deny the possibility of any man being able to know the secret processes of creation. Yet a large part of the Enochic literature, and in particular the book of the heavenly luminaries, represents it as the function of Enoch to bring this hidden knowledge within the reach of mankind. This means that our verses have not been borrowed from some other part of the book, and inserted here, either *per incuriam* or for a special purpose. They have been written for the place in which they occur. The man who wrote them was denying with conscious intention, he was even gravely scoffing at, the possibility of such knowledge being ever within the reach of the children of men. And he is denying this precisely because this little sect is claiming such esoteric knowledge, verse 10. The

verses are a deliberate rejection of the fundamental claim on the part of the sect to be the possessors of a peculiar and esoteric knowledge, which is not the possession of all Israel. If the author of the note goes beyond this, as indeed he does, and if he makes his rejection of the position of a sect reach so far as to deny the fundamental position of a great deal of the Enochic literature, it is not impossible to account for the fact. He may have been fundamentally out of sympathy with the weird posturings and empty phrases which fill up so much of the Enochic revelations as to the secrets of creation, and may consequently have been not unwilling to have his fling at the whole movement under cover of an attack on one particular phase of it. Or he may have been betrayed into doing what many a polemical writer has done before and since his time, viz., committing himself, in his attack on certain things which he disliked, to principles, the full scope of which he had not measured. I seem to have read arguments against sects, which recoiled like a boomerang on the man who uttered them. As for him, he was so pleased at the blow he had planted that he was wholly unconscious of the wound his weapon had given himself in its return stroke.

Who, now, were the oppressors, for the overthrow of whom the sect were to be entrusted with the sword, and the collapse of whose authority over the elect was to be so significant as to usher in, not only an age in the world's history, but the first act of the consummation? The writer does not distinctly define them, probably because it was unnecessary—all the men for whom he wrote knew who were meant. But their overthrow was to make two things possible. The one was a peaceful settlement in their homes on the part of the oppressed: the other was the erection of a worthy temple. Of these two results the latter is the more significant. For, if the writer was

an ordinary devout Jew, who held that Nehemiah's rebuilding of the temple was an epoch in the life of Jewry and who celebrated the feast of Dedication in remembrance of the Maccabean purification, there can be only one period to which the apocalypse must be relegated. In that case there was no need for such a man to expect the rebuilding of the temple, unless he was writing after its destruction in A.D. 70. If, however, the writer rejected the second temple in its entirety and regarded its purification by the Maccabees as imperfect, he might well set down as the first sign of the blessed era that the faithful were now to be at liberty to build an acceptable place of worship. To set the apocalypse after A.D. 70 is unlikely, since it involves fresh difficulties. We must look for some other period. And, not only in this place, but in several other passages of the Book of Enoch, the kings and oppressors whose overthrow is hotly desired or triumphantly promised are best interpreted as the Romans, or even as the Roman procurators.¹

Perhaps there we may find a clue to the most remarkable feature of the little apocalypse, its absolute condemnation of the entire work of reconstruction in the period of the return under Nehemiah. I have given above the most striking illustration of the same attitude to the second temple, but there are other hints, sporadic and not so uncompromising, which occur in the Book of Enoch and even in the Testaments of the Twelve, and which all point in the same direction. They are all tantalisingly vague, and are especially so on the very question on which we most desire that they should be clear. None of them ever says

¹ To this extent Nils Messel seems right in his recent book, *Der Menschensohn in den Biblischenreden des Henoch*. I confess, however, to finding grave difficulty when he relegates even the Similitudes, as he appears to do, to the same period.

why the writer condemns or distrusts that work of renewal. But I venture to suggest that the ground of objection may have been that the community of the return submitted to build their temple under the suzerainty of the heathen, and attempted to renew their torah under the limitations of a foreign domination. Certainly the writer did not object to the building of the temple in itself, since one of the first acts of the saints, when they have been set free from their oppressors, was to be the erection of the temple. As certainly he did not object to the law being made supreme in the community or to the measures by which the supremacy of the law was secured. For he expects the law to rule, and believes it possible to secure its authority by the sword. When, accordingly, it is noted that the first act in the great drama of the consummation is to be that power is to be given to the saints to shake off the hated domination of the oppressors, it is possible that he judged it an apostasy ever to have acknowledged that domination. When he, further, says that the close of the seventh age saw the rise of the elect, he may mean the Maccabees, so far as they aimed at, and for a time succeeded in, erecting an independent kingdom. Israel, in its straitest sects, had come to find how difficult it was to maintain the torah in all its integrity, unless the nation had control of its entire life. It found this task harder than ever under the just, but heavy and clumsy, foot of Rome. For themselves they would have none of this compromise. They were looking for a day when Yahweh should give them power to burst their bonds, to build a temple where no Roman soldiers kept watch and ward, and no heathen eyes viewed their sacrifices, to set up a polity about which they did not need to ask whether its demands collided with the Roman law. And, as they reviewed their past, they said that there was one day

when for the first time Israel entered into a fatal compromise. That was the day when they attempted to reconstitute their national life under Persia. On that day, because of this taint, all the works of the reformers were apostate.

In view of the fact that no writer ever states definitely what it was in the settlement at the return which offended him, it is impossible to say that this is more than a plausible theory. But it has one merit: it makes the apocalypse a consistent whole, and it explains why it was dislocated and annotated as it has been.

It suggests one final thought. We know that the Zealot party found large support in Galilee. We know that one Simon ceased to be Zelotes and became a Christian. We may guess at the reason for his change by contrasting this, his spiritual pabulum in the camp he left, with the tone which breathed through the family he joined. Much has been written of value about the books which influenced our Lord, but that has been mostly in the direction of discovering what He held in common with them. Perhaps this may provide another line of approach in the thought of the books which influenced Him through His reaction against them.

ADAM C. WELCH.

THE PREACHING OF JESUS AND THE GOSPEL OF CHRIST.¹

THE MEANING OF A SINLESS CHRIST.

It is very freely lamented in religious circles that no feature in the moral physiognomy of the day is more marked than the decay or absence of the sense of sin. And the remarkable thing is that it is a feature conspicuous in those circles most disposed to fall back on the teaching of Jesus in whom that sense was overwhelming. We are only putting the same thing in a more positive way when we observe the note of self-satisfaction, not only in the churches but in many of the pulpits of the day. Few seem to go beyond a general confession, with the strong phrases pruned. They have erred and strayed but not rebelled. They hesitate to call themselves miserable offenders, or to say there is no health in them. Few seem to doubt that there is a vague fatherhood that will make all safe at last. Few seem really to doubt their final salvation somehow, or to regard the whole phase of Christ's teaching which contains such a word as "the door was shut." Few consent to think of God the adversary with whom we must come to terms. Few seem afraid of being castaways. Few seem to feel but scarcely saved, or bought with an awful price. Few seem to realize a moral risk other than social discovery and disgrace. Few seem to have much idea of vigilance in connexion with their Christian life and destiny; they do not watch unto prayer, nor are they alert for the Eternal as for the humane. The old notion of spiritual conflict, of an agony at a strait gate, of a peril of perdition, seems to have died out of the

¹ This is the concluding article of a series which began in the *EXPOSITOR* in 1915.

Christian life. Many of the seniors, it is true, are exercised about the collisions of a business career with Christian ethic. And young people, to be sure, still struggle with certain temptations, and complain much of their need and of the little help they get. But that is not what I mean. I mean doubt or conflict about our mature or final position in God's sight in the great trial, doubt about how we shall stand the great inquest of righteousness (when and wherever it comes—perhaps in a world-war) which meant so much for Jesus. People question everything now except their secure standing somehow with the God with whom they seldom have personal dealings or spiritual rest, and who is most valuable as an anodyne. They like to discuss questions about the existence of a God, His personality, His relation to Nature, and especially to Society, or even to Christ, about immanence, about immortality, about eternal punishment, and so on—only not about the state of their soul before Holy God where Jesus saw all things set and all souls judged. They are interested in religious problems, but not in the intimate problem of themselves and their spiritual destiny. Liberalism has narcotised them with a world accepting ethic. Their concern is sprightly. They have some perplexity but no real misgiving. Science unsettles them in a pleasant sort of way, with a risky joy-like switchback ride; but the floor does not fall out of their moral world. They have never looked into the bottomless pit. Their spiritual safety is a genial matter of course. The love of God they can always depend on. The only doubt they know is interesting, intellectual doubt. Real religious doubt, concern about the soul of the race and goal of the world, belongs to a stage now outgrown. And so we speak of winning souls instead of converting them. We charm them wisely. We attract them kindly, and then when we get them in we do not always know what to do

with them as souls. We cannot kindle them as the war has done. We try sometimes to answer intellectual doubt without providing the moral education that makes the answer intelligible. Whereas it might serve us better to aggravate and deepen it into religious doubt, fatal doubt of the kind that sears, and is really laid only by personal and evangelical faith. But it grows more and more hard for the preacher, as society grows in comfort and kindness, to get through the tough soft rind of self-certainty, rising to self-satisfaction and even to self-complacency, which the general type of religion so often tends to breed. And it may be that there was nothing for it, even for God, but this huge calamity to shake us to our moral senses. He turns outward the judgment side of the salvation of the Cross.

When the Church makes this admission it makes more—it makes a confession. The Church has not only to admit that it does not bring the world to contrition, but it has to confess that it lacks the power to impress upon its own members the meaning, the gravity of their sin, i.e. of the conscience of Jesus, whether put into His teaching or His conflict and Cross, or to make them realise the true moral inwardness both of His preaching and His passion. Even the war has not yet roused in the mass of good people the sense of moral awe. Our modern amiability smothers the flame of moral passion and profound thought, as the ash of our Christmas decorations puts the fire out when we crush them into the grate. Our religious growth, whatever direction it takes, does not include this. And it misses it, it does not take seriously enough the very words of Jesus, because it misses the authentic note of the Cross in the Gospel. The Church can stir people to compassionate kindness, to seemly worship, to much reverence for the name of Christ

and the claim of religion. It can win from them large sums of money, and much practical sacrifice (however little it may *cost*). But it does not bring them to repentance, in any such searching sense of the word as it bore even in the discourses either of the Baptist or the Christ. Mystic piety is much more easy to produce, and more agreeable to feel, than penitent faith. Faith has been identified with love in an easy way that detaches it from the holiness that brought love to the Cross; and so it is severed from repentance. It is our treatment of the Cross that has reduced us below the penitential pitch with which Jesus began.

It is not that efforts are not made by preachers to redress this state of things, and to do so by a return to our Bible, and even to the Bible Christ.

1. We preach the wondrous, patient, endless love of God as the message of Christ. We say this preaching was the one thing He came to do. It was to hold up to us this love of God, shame us with our neglect of it, humble us with its ideal, and win us by its sacrifice. But it is doubtful if this produces more than a compunction far short of the repentance of faith at which Jesus aimed. And certainly it does not succeed in producing the effect that Christ in His conquering death had on His own. The remorse for our blindness to love can be dreadful enough, but it is not so humbling nor so hopeful as a repentance before the Holy One and our wound to Him. The dulness to sin, which I named has been concurrent with an unprecedented sensibility to the charming and the tender in God or man, with a Gospel and theology of the endless mercy and pity of God. But it may even be a case of cause and not more concurrence. The preaching of this tender, unwearyed and universal love of God may be the cause of the deadening of the sense of sin. Pity ousts grace, and purity holiness. Sin is then reduced to a misconstruction by us of God's love and a

misunderstanding, which Christ came to put right. But the sense of sin, if we take its truly Christian form of humility, is due to something more than a charge against ourselves of misconstruction, or even fault. Humility is not a product of repentance alone, far less of chagrin. It is produced by a revelation not only of God's love but of the moral greatness and wonder of it; meaning thereby especially its qualitative greatness—not merely its amount or intensity, but its holiness. Life is not really "measured by intensity," any more than by duration, but at last by conscience, by sanctity. It is a blessed sense of the holy majesty of God's love that really kills our self-satisfaction and becomes the standing source of a habitual humility. "As is thy majesty so is thy mercy." A humility that rises but from a sense of guilt and repentance easily leads to self-scourging, and similar sterile forms of self-degradation. If we are told that Jesus set forth the love of God with little reference to His holiness let us recall His humility, both of word and life. His humility was not before the God of love but before the holy God (if we distinguish the inseparable). And His nearest explained it neither by the half-god of Arianism nor by the spiritual genius found in Jesus by modern thought, but only by a Son as holy in His eternal obedience as the Father in His eternity of sovereign sanctity. And so with us in our place and measure. The repentance not to be repented of comes with the exalted humility which at once faces and shares the holy majesty of God in the power of His new-creating Grace in Christ's Cross. Such at least is the apostolic witness. God so loved the world—not so intensely, nor so kindly, but so holily—that He gave His only Son—as a propitiation (says the same pen) to His holy name; that whosoever is united to Him should not perish in a mere repentance but should rise to the humility of Life holy and eternal. Was

that a misunderstanding of the message of Jesus by those He did most to teach? Was it a perversion of His preaching by its most constant audience?

2. Or perhaps we preach the sinlessness of Christ as exhibited in the gospels of His word and deed, and try to make men measure themselves against that example or ideal. But sinlessness is after all a negative idea, and, in so far, incapable of producing a sense of sin. What is the positive bearing of Christ's sinlessness on *me* except as a positive revelation, as an energy, an act, of the holiness of God? No passive or negative purity, harmless and undefiled, can produce an effect so great and searching. Unworldliness cannot make us feel much more than unworthiness. We admire the figure of one so far above our weak will and our mixed motives; but the spectacle of a life so cloistered and remote does not humble or break us to the repentance of the saints as the holiness of the Cross does, which emerges in that final act of God at the passionate centre of man's tragic soul and history with a reality more active, positive, and masterful than our own worldly will of sin.

If we pass beyond the negative idea of sinlessness, and see in Christ's life one actively holy even unto death, the mere *spectacle* of holiness, even though it be beneficent and not merely unspotted, is after all but an æsthetic one—a piece of moral æsthetic like so much that deludes the conscience in a literary age. It is not dynamic for us, as the effect of Christ's death certainly was. It declares much but conveys little. It erects an ideal for admiration, but it does not go to the roots of the soul, tears up the matted weeds, and plant new life. The act of sin is not countered by an act in God. We do not rise beyond the best Hellenic range of morals, fertilised by Judaism. No mere worship of a most holy life can search, humble, confound and re-create

us, as Christ has done to His classic own from His Cross. It does not carry us beyond saint-worship. Only the Cross has given Jesus the personal devotion His preaching claimed. The worship of the ideal Holy One could never have produced either the medieval Church or its Reformation. The Trisagion does not lift the Greek Church to the level of the Church of the West. It could not produce the Church which produced the Reformation. Besides, if the spectacle of a life of saintly beneficence or guidance were the main element in a divine revelation founding a religion, why was Christ's life and preaching so brief? Would it not have been more effective had it been prolonged to a ripe and mellow age, and had it proved and exhibited this sanctity in many more junctures and relations of life than we find in Him? He seemed to deprecate, also, we remember, an attitude to Him which simply called Him good, even in the highest degree. The records are too scanty to carry a picture of such holiness of life as both crushes and lifts us into the worship of the real presence of the Holiest God. From Christ's words and conduct we do gain the sense of the righteous Father of love, judgment, and salvation; but we do not even there gain that sense of holiness which destroys egoism and creates the most profound repentance, saving faith, and brotherly love.

The sinlessness reflected in the words as in the carriage of Jesus cannot be quite certain to us from the Gospel record of these. He did not so preach Himself to Israel, though He has so conveyed Himself to mankind. The story is not detailed enough in incident for that purpose, nor is it psychological enough in its insight. The belief cannot arise as the empirical impression from a life which we are allowed to see victorious in every phase of temptation, or whose suggestions we can trace pure to their inmost cell. For though He

was tempted in all reality like us. He was not tempted at every point; things that are deadly temptations to us were none to Him. We can believe the sinlessness of Jesus only in its positive form of complete holiness, i.e. in its perfect relation and satisfaction to a holy God. But how are we to judge of that? We cannot see Him with God's eyes, nor weigh Him in God's scales. We must take God's word for it; and pre-eminently the great and crowning word of the Resurrection; wherein God, by a supreme act upon Him more powerful than any words, declared Himself perfectly well pleased with Him in that perfect work of the Cross where His whole life and person took effect in an act meant for God and fully understood by Him alone. We can realise His holiness with due gravity and certainty only from such an expression of Christ's final hallowing and complete delighting of holy God, His destruction of evil, and His re-creation of the race in a conflict not subliminal merely but truly moral, psychological, historic, and yet absolute. A victory in this region which were only relatively greater than ours, greater in degree but not in kind, corresponds neither to gospel nor epistle. It certainly destroys Christ's value as Saviour. It would not justify our worship of Him, nor entitle us to commit our sinful soul to Him for ever, without some flavour of idolatry.

The difficulties of course for systematic thought are here great, if not insuperable. It may be said that a temptation really like ours is incompatible with real unity with the God who is always above these stormy levels. And the only reply, here as often elsewhere, is that the two things cannot be reconciled by co-ordinating and adjusting, as if we were handling two empirical facts or truths. The fallacy of treating Revelation chiefly as truth and not experience becomes very mischievous here. And the reconciliation of the two things can only lie in our own—in the convic-

tion and experience of the Church's faith that, in the work of Christ's person which makes us what we are with God, in the new life, we do have a supreme form of the paradox which is greatest in the greatest religions. We have His real unity with God riding, guiding, and ruling a real conflict, whose chief form was not in the wilderness with demons nor in the market place with Pharisees, but on the Cross. It was on the Cross as the crisis of all His crises, nay, as the node of the tragedy of existence, as the seal of every moral conquest besides, and the surety of every victory of ours—ours, who are more than fellow-conquerors, being loved and redeemed by His grace in which we stand. If His words touch us nearly and powerfully this work changes us for good and all, from glory to glory, in the Lord the Spirit.

The active holiness of Christ preached the holiness of a God who is the Act Eternal. And His preaching was not mere utterance, but revelation. It consisted in revealing the holiness of God, and not in enabling us to infer it. It enacted it, it did not simply reflect it. That is to say, it consisted in putting it into final and universal effect among men, as only a great and real act of God could do. It was not in exhibiting or exposing God's holiness in a spectacular, or æsthetic, or impressive way, but in conveying and establishing it. The cross set up the holy kingdom which the parables revealed. The Holy Father He preached Christ brought home to life by something that only the Holy Son of living God and actual man could do. His revelation was in the redemption, and not in something that led to it. It is a revelation and a redemption effected only by Atonement (unless the rest of the New Testament is a bathos upon the gospels); effected by a holy act that gives full justice and joy to the irrefragable holiness of God; by the satisfaction and delight given to that holiness of love by Him who alone knew it, and who could therefore meet it in the Cross and the judgment hallowed there.

The historic obedience of the Cross, crowning the obedient holiness of Christ always, reveals, conveys and establishes for ever in the world the obeyed holiness of God. He perfected an obedience in which the Father found an entire satisfaction, or, in the language of the gospels, one in which He was well pleased. The miracle of Grace in Christ's death is the measure of that holiness—the Grace measures it and not the agony there, nor even the love. The supreme miracle is the union in Christ's God of holiness and grace. It is not simply the love of God that we have in the Cross, but His holy love dealing with sin in grace. Nowhere but in Christ's blood do we gain the due sense of God's holy love, or answer duly the revelation of which His words were full. It is the Cross that makes these truths revelation. The fulness of both Father and Son was about its true business in the Cross. Because, while other things might give us a sense of love's amount, this alone, I have been saying, gives us a due sense of its divine kind, its kind not simply as saintly, but as holy enough to be the perfect propitiation to holiness. It is the kind of the love that matters—holy, gracious and effectual on God and creative on man. God so loved, in such a way, that in Grace He gave for man a propitiation to His own holiness. Christ died because God required it; and God required it not simply as a lever to lift man but as a function of the self-respect of the Absolute, for His personal satisfaction and the hallowing of His eternal name. And who outside of His Godhead could do that? My point throughout is that the profounder reading of the gospels discovers this to be the latent mind of Jesus. It is the propitiatory element, the element that gives its due from among sinners to the personal holiness of God—that is the distinctive thing in the love of God as declared, preached, brought home by the whole Christ.

No human analogies or parables available in the dis-

course even of Jesus can indicate more than the intensity and persistency of God's love. They do not do justice to its nature. They do not open up the holiness of it, none of them being holy as the Son was holy. They do not give us that in it which makes the real gulf between God and man, and therefore not that which bridges it, that which relates His love at once to holiness and to sin. For the ideal of human love is reciprocity, mutuality, instinctive and without more ado ; but the ideal of God's is reconciliation, redemption. In the one case we love those we find lovable or cannot help loving, in the other God loves those He finds hateful and malignant. The one loves with the instinctive unfreedom of nature, the other with the freedom which belongs only to choice, effort, and Grace. The divine quality is not the love but the holiness of it, and the miracle in it is its costly Grace, the standing miracle of a saving, instead of a consuming, contact between sanctity and sin. And this holiness of it means farther its nature, necessity, and power to establish itself in command everywhere, in the face of its antagonist and on the site of its negation—sin : to do so by abolishing the antagonism without abolishing the soul, but by subduing it to itself, and converting the quality and direction of its passion to holiness instead of annihilating it. Love in the face of sin can only assert itself as holy love : but that means as stung and wounded love. But assert itself it must, and not doctrinally only by the most urgent discourse, nor negatively in punishment merely, but positively in righteousness ; so that judgment is not a terror but a hope, and the day of the Lord is not convulsion and catastrophe but creation, a new heaven and earth, wherein dwell the peace of righteousness and assurance for ever. Holy love must heal itself. The personality of God, being holy, must recover and assert itself in the sanctification of the whole universe, and by its own re-

sources make itself good in its infinite harmony everywhere, in and between all souls. Its Apostle and its Gospel must treat its holiness seriously, as a first charge, as God's first concern. His one concern with man is to make him holy as He is holy. And this a holy love like Christ's could never do—it could never take its own holiness seriously—by just exhibiting a human ideal, type, or pattern, sacred in word and in action kind. That were too inert to be duly serious, serious adequately to the whole energy and action of God's person or man's crime ; for lovelessness is too languid and negative as a description of the diabolism of human sin. The hallowing of God's name could be done only by really judging and subjugating once for all the unholy thing everywhere, killing it in its eye, and replacing Satan's kingdom by the kingdom of God. It could be done only by bringing to practical effect an answering and trusting holiness on a world scale amid the extremest conditions created by human sin, by bringing universal sin to the final light and fire of the eternal holiness it challenged, by showing both sin in its radical sinfulness and destroying it in the searching and consuming fire of holy heavenly love on earth. And this the death of Christ alone did ; and, if He began and ended with the Father of holy love, He knew it did, even if He did not know it in theological categories but in personal. The death of Christ did it, as the active, and imperishable, and precious point, what we might call the diamond drill, of His whole life, person and energy. It was a piercing, a judgment, and a destruction in principle of the unholy power: and this by the enthronement of the Holy in the arena of human experience, under the conditions of a historic situation concrete with the soul of the race,¹ and on the infinite and eternal scale. It was a last judgment. More even the Almighty could not do. "O God, who

It was the man that Jesus found in the Jew.

showest Thine omnipotence most chiefly in having mercy and forgiving." Our salvation is only secure by that finality of judgment—only if there was now no more condemnation. The Redemption was objective thus, scathing all sin in this light by the same act which ransomed the sinner neither from God nor death but from godless death, and regenerated him with eternal life. The confession, the revelation, the establishment of holiness in Christ's Cross is the only means for the due revelation and destruction of sin, and for the erection of the holy kingdom by a hallowed King. It begets a conviction of sin and a repentance and confession of it, according to our living faith. No real confession of man's sin is possible which is not much more a confession of God's holiness. And this is the only sense in which Christ could confess our sin—by no such moral impossibility as a vicarious repentance, but by what is the divine thing in repentance, by the practical and atoning confession of God's sanctity. Sin is not a thing, it is a personal relation; and Atonement has meaning only as the adjustment of that relation in a way that must affect both sides and not man alone.

If the forced and final crisis of God's holy honour to His holiness in Christ's Cross was the supreme means of discovering sin in its sinfulness, then the chief reason why the sense of sin has fallen below the level of Christ's preaching is because this Atonement, to which the preaching rose, passes out of our message and leaves it without due moral force. The modification of our views about Eternal Punishment has led to the decay of the idea of judgment and hell altogether for the general mind, to its huge moral loss. And so the necessary modification of our views (more legal than moral) about an equivalent penalty in the Atonement has caused the whole

matter to pass from our practical conscience and experimental concern ; because atonement and equivalence were held to be convertible terms, and God's satisfaction in the Cross was made to seem His joy, not in His dear and holy Son, but in a *quid pro quo*. And things have now gone so far that the Cross is regarded as a simple exhibition of God's love in sacrifice, and an exhibition more public in aim than powerful in effect. Sacrifice is honoured for its own sake, as in some of the most exasperating martyrdoms of life, which are simply ethical ritualism, equally gratuitous and epidemic. The eternal Guardian of the universal and immutable morality of holiness is made to regard and court nothing but man's love—as if we could divinely trust one whose passion to love and be loved overrode everything else ; as if our conscience did not go behind such a God, and demand, in some form of justification, an understanding with the holiness we defiled. We could not respect, to say nothing of worship, a God who was love and nothing more, who smothered our conscience in it, and taught love at any cost. We could not honour a God owing nothing to Himself as the eternal and universal Righteousness beyond a grand prophet's message of mercy. That would not honour the God Christ preached. We could not treat as God a being too large in his build, too free and generous in his nature's lines, to be careful about anything in himself corresponding infinitely to our self-respect. The holiness of God is the self-respect of an absolute universal ; and it is the death of Egoism, and the very stay and cohesion of social and cosmic existence. Could such a kindly God deal in love's saving way with creatures in whom He has placed conscience as an echo, or even a facet, of His own righteousness ? Could such a God be capable of real regenerative forgiveness, or of anything beyond amnesty and benevolence ? Is forgiveness worth anything which does not cost ? If

it do not cost can it create ? And can it cost in any real sense if it is shown forth in a sacrifice which, however painful, is arbitrary merely, out of ethical relation to guilt, a piece of divine rhetoric without moral logic or urgency, merely impressionist and not regenerative, a sacred pose for sacred effect, and not a necessity which holiness makes ? Even if such a God do not make light of sin He does not make enough of it. He does not make what the best conscience makes of it. He does not make *sin* of it, guilt of it, an eternal sin. He makes ignorance, weakness, waywardness, imperfection of it—a child's faults—but not sin, not the sin of adult defiance, and deadly hate, and desperate wickedness. His holiness does not react against it with the whole passion of His eternal energy. The passion for His own holiness (which is the cohesion of the universe) is less than the passion for men's souls—meaning by that their affection. His desire to be loved, and to make men happy in that love, renders Him comparatively indifferent to the moral conditions on which love is great, and on which alone love can abide, and rule, and worship, and glorify Him. Nothing but the cross of Christ has power to glorify and bring to its own the holy God that Christ preached. His Cross preaches it with a success that failed His words, but it was the same gospel.

With such a cordial God as has taken the place of Christ's God need we ask why the moral influence of the pulpit decays in the very midst of its popularity ; why preaching, as it grows interesting, and delightful, and humane, grows ineffective also upon moral life wherever the conflict is severe ; why, especially, it is without effect on the ethic of international life, of public life, and of business life, where energy is tense and serious ? As if any Gospel could affect more than the domestic side of life (that but for a time) which treated with so much ease the claim of universal

righteousness in the holy nature of God. Nothing but holiness with the imperative of the Eternal is mighty enough to give the law to the conscience of the race and make love eternal. And such is the holiness that goes to action in Christ's cross alone. Some theories of justification are perverted enough. And it must be owned that these perversions contribute their own part to the debasement of our public ethic; for the public effect of our theology for good or ill is greater than we know at the time. But at least they do recognise the claim of a universal righteousness, a superhuman holiness. And they properly exhibit God's love for man as dealing with that holiness first of all—even for man's sake. They show, though often dimly and inconsistently, Godhead actually accepting for us the judgment of its own holiness. That is what really moves us to our moral centre, and so moves us as to leave us with no resisting power, so moves us as to change us, and so changes us as to make a new creation of our forfeit lives. The real justification is also regeneration. The other, the genial, Gospel is not a real dynamo, however moving the gifted and tender preacher be. And still more it is not a regeneration. It is not creative. And, however it may sustain an audience, or even a busy philanthropy on the scale of a congregation, it has not the range and depth of moral appeal that makes a Church of the Cross and captures society as a whole, because it does not grasp, and does not search, and does not satisfy the whole moral soul. There is something in a direct effort to impress us and capture our love which stiffens us to resist. The man who sits down deliberately and toils to move us and make us cry makes the people whose tears would be worth most to smile. Tears, moods, are but a tribute to real action, not its object. And the Gospel of a Saviour who even dies just to impress us with His love, instead of surprising us with joy as we discover

Him going to the business of our case and really acting for us with God and against our enemy, captor, and accuser—the Gospel of such a Saviour must be ineffective on all but the weak. It is an æsthetic Gospel; sympathetic at best, and at worst sentimental; it is not action, it does not work; and it is part cause, part effect, of that green mould of sentimentalism which is sapping so much popular religion, and sinking adult men to read novels of mawkish piety that sell in tens of thousands and madden the manly mind to refuge in *Tom Jones*. I confess if I regard but the moral result of the Cross, and seek to court its impressive action on me, I am far less moved by it than I wish to be, and I catch myself pursuing the mood I seem to lack rather than worshipping the Saviour. It is most impressive and fortifying to us when we regard that aspect of it which is not turned on us, but for us on God. It moves us most as the awful conflict and work for us sinners, caught amid spiritual powers that bemaze us, wherein God in Christ makes our bad cause His own, meets His own charge against us, Himself takes His own judgment of our sin, Himself for us faces our fierce accuser, meets and conquers the evil power that holds us, and saves us from a world riot of spiritual wickedness which He alone can measure and manage, not we. It is most impressive when we see Christ so engrossed in that objective task of subduing the reign of Satan to the kingdom of God in us that His desire for our love and trust is secondary, and, for the hour, may even be absent, in His thought. Only then have we the moral security which is so much more for the life of society or the soul than a melting love. Our daily prayer should certainly be to flow down more at the presence of God's love. But only thus can we be so melted that we run permanently into a quite new moral mould, receive the regeneration, and are created anew into Eternal Life. Only thus is the new love also a

new creation and a new life. We must have a God who *enacts* with us not only His love but His holiness no less. And holiness must go into action with sin as judgment, only not as judgment alone but, being holy love, also as grace. If love in the face of need or suffering can only be enacted and satisfied in sacrifice, in the face of sin holiness can only be enacted by its satisfaction in judgment, such judgment as God took for us in Christ's Cross, where He loved us much but honour, God's honour, more.

Were these thoughts, in whatever form, alien and absent from the mind of Jesus, His sonship to God, and His work for men? Is it really possible, for a criticism that settles from each extreme to its sober place, to deny that Jesus regarded it as the demand of a holy God that Messiah should go to death as a sacrifice for the sin of the world? There is no doubt about such a view being central to Paul's or Peter's or John's creed of the revelation of love. In this respect there is no real difference between the preaching of Jesus and the Gospel of Christ which made the preaching of the Apostles. And the attention we give to the latter is but a fuller exposition of the former, in a way required by the religious conscience of the race.

We shall never revive the sense of sin, regenerate the pagan conscience of Christendom, and set up the new ethic except by something that effectually revives for us the worship of holiness, something which is the energy not of love alone but of holy love—its real action, and not its mere manifestation. A real Atonement must come home and engage the conscience. We could not, and should not, listen to the Atonement sermons of fifty years ago. There has taken place a change of key. We are in process of a new orientation. And this is adjusted neither to the sinless character of Christ, nor to His profound teaching, nor to any exhibition, even

by Him, of mere fatherhood. We have from the Father more than the Father ; we have an Advocate with the Father. That is, we have a holy Father, whose holiness, and not His mere justice, both requires a propitiation and makes it. We have a God who in Christ is absolutely satisfied with His holy self. We have no power in history or in the soul that can reconstruct for us the truth of this matter but the Cross of Christ in its apostolic note of moral realism, mystic love, and racial redemption. God is Father only in Christ, and in the Christ whose holiness brought His love to the Cross. We must ethicise religion—so long as we do not reduce it to an ethic, or make the Kingdom of God but the organisation of society in love. But it cannot be done at the story of the Prodigal, but only at the Cross, as the glorifying of God's holiness by sin's judgment, at His own loving cost, for our moral recovery and Eternal Life. We shall not revive the sense of sin, and with it moral earnestness, we shall not heal religion of its moral slackness and its leprosy of non-moral sentimentalism, till we cease to regard man's need as the first charge upon the Gospel of Christ's Cross. We must come to recognise that first charge for what Christ Himself felt it to be—God's claim for the hallowing of His name as the real nature and the real establishment of the Kingdom. It is not the first condition precedent to the Kingdom ; it is the veritable setting up of the Kingdom, the reconstitution among men of the Holy Throne, and the reign of its King.

I am as sure that the element of holiness in God's love was the ruling thing in the mind of the Jesus of action as I am at a loss to explain why it should be so far from explicit on the lips of Jesus the preacher, midway as He stood between the prominent holiness of the Old Testament and the New Testament place of the Holy Spirit. I do not feel

that He avoided the word, or that the Evangelists did, because it was so engrained in the ceremonial Judaism which was the first Antichrist. For that would have prevented the use of words or ideas like sacrifice or blood. And I fear that one suggestion that offers itself to me here may be found more subtle than sound. But I will venture this. Love is a message and a gift that comes home to individuals and readily finds them; it fills the mouth of those who deal with individuals or groups of them; but holiness has a much less swift access, as may be proved upon any average congregation, whether of preachers or people. Its appeal is rather on the scale of the race, of the great conscience, whether of man or of God; and it supposes more maturity of moral concern than does an appeal to anything so prompt and general as love. A message of kindness is always more welcome than one of righteousness. Now Jesus did not begin His preaching with an appeal to the race, nor with the fate of the race, but with Israel. The bearing of His mission on the race was forced on Him as He went on to such ill success with His own people. And it is now almost a commonplace to say that it was the Cross that really universalised Christianity. There was therefore in the prophetic days and the preached appeals of Jesus less about the holiness and more about the mercy of the Father. For, on the one hand, He spoke as man had never spoken to the individual, and especially to the poor, with whom a heart appeal is more intelligible than a moral. And on the other hand, He spoke to the nation and its leaders, both familiar with the prophet's word of the righteous judge, and of the judgment day of the Lord in more or less apocalyptic form. He is as emphatic about the judgment to them as He is about the Father's love to the soul, sad or lost. And, as it is the holiness of God, applied as righteousness, that is the principle of all His judgments,

there is no lack of the idea of holiness wherever judgment takes the prominent place it did in a soul like Christ's or its speech. And this is shown by the fact that, when the righteousness of God had been made honourable and universal in the Cross, there not only came speech of the holiness of the Father (especially in John) but that feature rose to be a factor in Godhead alongside Father and Son, in the experience and doctrine of the Holy Spirit ; by whom Jesus both died and rose for the eternal salvation of the conscience of the race, in Whom, therefore, proceeding from Christ's perfect work-sacrifice becomes Atonement, ethic becomes religion, and goodness cannot stop short of entire sanctification.

We must not allow ourselves to be robbed of the apostolic height and depth within the Cross just because Jesus did not turn to explain Himself to men in the judgment hour of His engagement with a holy and elusive God, when He made His whole soul an offering to Him for sin. He explained by His Spirit, when it was all over and done. It is no part of divine greatness that it should be obvious and unmistakable. And if the dereliction was Christ's sense of the certainty but the elusiveness of the Holy Love, we must not let a like elusiveness in His own express words take from us the certainty which He gave us in a fulness of time, when, as the Holy Spirit, He spoke to us, by His apostles, of what was really accomplished in His death beyond all the insight of the best natural religion, or of a piety historic and homely but nothing more.

It may be more true to our theme to have pursued it as a principle than to have set it out in a systematic form, whose clear edges are apt to reduce the impressiveness of the vast spiritual contours. But after what has been said it may not be dangerous to condense into a few drops much that has saturated what has gone before ; and to do it by touch-

ing some of the lines that prolong the preaching of Jesus into the Gospel of Paul and the Church.

For the one as for the other God was the God of Almighty and Holy Love : and it was the holiness of the love that perfected the Lover in His Cross. (It is perhaps hardly necessary at this stage to say that by the holiness of God is not meant anything merely transcendent and remote, but something intimate, concrete, ethical, social and historic, with all its mystic solemnity ; so that righteousness is applied holiness.) Christ made offering in His death to the sovereign and imperative element in God's love rather than to the sympathetic, which in the sharp crisis of His great act He lost. That Cross was the greatest thing that Jesus did, it condensed His whole life and person ; and, within that supreme act, the decisive moment reflected its chief aspect : it was therefore a sacrifice to the holy will of God before it was a blessing to the need of man. In Jesus as in Paul, though in different forms, we have the principles of sacrifice, expiation, and vicariousness : and for each they formed a divine requirement. The sacrifice satisfied the will, purpose, and heart of God. It founded a new covenant of atoned forgiveness. It was a vicarious act of the One for the many. And it was offered to the judgment inseparable from a holy God, but on that same God's initiative as the holy Father. It is surely impossible to say that the Jesus of the Passion felt no strain between God's pitiful and His righteous holy love. If the theoretical adjustment is hard for the theologian, how much harder the practical in the personal experience and act of the Redeemer. Reconciliation in a personality is always harder than adjustment in a system, because it is more religious. But the two forms of reconciliation, that of Jesus and that of Paul, are not only not incompatible they are inseparable. The minting is different, but the currency

is the same. And for both Jesus and Paul the reconciling act was God's act of judgment-grace, holy mercy and righteous love.

For Jesus as for Paul the whole of mankind needs this Redemption. And it comes not by God's gift of a law whose keeping earns it, but by a pure gift of Grace. That, and not reward, is for both the principle of Salvation. It was the Father's good pleasure to give the kingdom. And to all the labourers alike He gives no wage, but what He thinks fit. Salvation is a matter not of right but of Grace. And therefore it is a matter of the Faith that answers Grace by its appropriation, not as an assent but as an experience. For both it is faith in the person of Christ : and in that person not as the ideal of spiritual excellence but as the active, dramatic Messiah, Judge, Quickener, and Regenerator of the soul of the race. For both it is a salvation as universal as the sin is—though for Jesus in the first stage of its process His address was to Israel. Yet it was the man He sought and found in the Jew. It is not Paul but Jesus that first teaches the blessing of His ransoming work upon the Cross to the many. And He does so as the Messiah, who embodies God's will with mankind, and with whom all must reckon at last.

For both Jesus and Paul the law was an ethical thing, of which Jesus took control as He was the living conscience of both God and man ; so that He alters and amends it morally in such a matter as divorce. And He does such things in the name of the holy love whose law it was. The one might have said the greatest words of the other about love. (And indeed it is our faith that when Paul uttered such words it was Christ who said them.) Yet for neither could love ride over law, but it must deal with it.

For both the secret of the Son's person and cross was His holy obedience, His obedience therefore to the holy ;

and when we hear in Philippians ii. 8 that Jesus was exalted to a universal reign by His obedience to death and to the Cross, it is but the reflection of all that we find both in the doctrine and the movement of the Gospels.

It were better that everything should remain unsaid than that anything should be spoken that might tend to belittle the teaching of Christ or deflect His preaching of His salvation. If any way of putting things here should seem to suggest that, it would be a *bitise* quite foreign to my intent. There is not and cannot be any such truth in spoken word as there is in the word of Jesus. There is not, and never will be, truth coming from such a depth of inward life, and such a union of God and man. It is such truth, so great, deep and final, that it cannot be followed except in the power from whose depths it came without Christ's person behind it, and the Cross at the centre of that person and at the source of His Spirit. If we speak of the failure of Christ's preaching it was its failure with those who would have none of the Cross, and who therefore severed the truth of the Word from the power of the Deed. It was not the word of Christ that failed men, but men that failed His Word and Him. To treat Christ as a prophet without finding Him our priest, and to honour Him as our Master without calling Him our Absolute King, whose property we are by the purchase of His blood—that is to revere Him as He did not seek reverence, and to refuse Him the worship that is His own. Never man spake as this man because God never acted as He did in His Son. The truth of Jesus comes to itself and its own only in the Cross of Christ. The grace to the Prodigal Son becomes a certainty for the world only in the atoning work of the Son Eternal. The disciples who heard all the Lord said became apostles only at the grave of God's own Apostle.

—shall we say, of God as Apostle? And the group of His companions became the core of His Church only because of the founding of the kingdom in the mortal deed whose victory could not be holden of death, and whose truth, buried by old Israel, came to itself as power in the creation of a new Society to be the earnest of the New Humanity. In the work of Christ His words also rose again from the dead to an immortal life and power.

Finally, it may avert one misunderstanding, or parry one criticism, if I close with the remark that the necessary truth in such views as I have set out is a necessity for the Church more than for its individual members—affecting the simple soul as that must be affected by a standing or falling Church. It is not always quite relevant, therefore, if stray and lone voices, even in considerable numbers, plead that such a type of faith they do not feel to need for their own soul's peace or good.

P. T. FORSYTH.

THE GOSPEL OF EVIDENCE.

THE Fourth Gospel, so far as the main thesis of the work is concerned, is not historical but theological.

It is Apologetic Theology. This is clearly stated in xx 31.

“But these are written, that ye may believe that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God, and that believing ye may have life in his name.”

Whether this was the writer's own statement of his purpose, or an addition illustrating the belief of the early Christians, matters not at all. The Gospel was accepted as carefully compiled for a special purpose.¹ Much more could have

¹ Cf. Clement in Eusebius, vi. 14.

been related (xx. 30. xxi. 35). The writer has *selected* his material. Dr. Gore writes, "*Belief in Christ*" (p. 106):

"The main, though not the only, object of the writing of the Gospel appears to be to affirm the doctrine (of the divine Sonship and incarnation of Jesus Christ), with all the authority which the personal testimony of the author can give it."

Von Soden, *Early Christian Literature* (p. 414 f.), says:

"The main purpose is to give a comprehensive demonstration, in opposition to the objections of the Jews, of the proposition 'Jesus is the Christ,' and to declare its significance. It presents an apology for the Christian Faith as opposed to Judaism."

H. L. Jackson, *The Fourth Gospel* (1906), quoting Von Soden as above, denies that this is all that can be said.

The Fourth Gospel, then, consists of material purposively chosen by the writer from

1. Previously written records;
2. Oral tradition;
3. Incidents or sayings of which he had himself personal knowledge;

together with

4. His own interpretation or view of any of the foregoing.

It is necessary in studying the relation of this Gospel to the Synoptics to consider how far our writer's professed object may go in accounting for or explaining differences of incident or of teaching.

We venture once again to quote from Dr. Gore, *Belief in Christ* (pp. 111, 113, 115).

"Here in the Fourth Gospel, then, St. John, presupposing the Synoptic record, supplements it with incidents and discourses especially intended to bear on the point of divine sonship . . . what we are presented with in our Lord's words, is an indisputable and constantly reiterated assertion on His part of divine sonship. . . .

"The author's mind is preoccupied with making it evident that Jesus was really the Son of God."

In view of all this, which may, it would seem, be taken as

proved, it is very remarkable that the Fourth Gospel presents itself in quite an exceptional degree as the Gospel of guaranteed Evidence. Emphasis is laid upon this point throughout, which has perhaps hardly received adequate attention. There is a suggestion of controversy in regard to other gospel writings, and an indication of a demand for evidence. (Cf. esp. xix. 35, xxi. 24, xvii. 8, 21, 23, 25, and I John i. 1-3.) *μαρτυρία* and *μαρτυρέω* are used about fifty times in the Fourth Gospel (six times in chap. i.), against once in the Synoptists (Lk. xxiv. 48). The classical use of the word seems to have been chiefly that of giving evidence in court; it is therefore a strong word and would seem to carry an implication of guaranteed truth. Precisely this was required for any written account of the things that Jesus began both to do and to teach. It would, of course, be still more necessary to so support the special purpose of this gospel. We are expressly told (Acts i. 8) that the Holy Spirit is to come upon the apostles, conveying "power" for the evidence they are to give.

The preface to Luke (i. 2) has the same intention narrowed a little in the words *ἀνέπτυται ἀπ' ἀρχῆς* (cf. Lk. xxiv. 48; John xv. 27). Absence of *μαρτυρία* from Mark and Matthew is possibly an indication of earlier date. In the sense we are now considering the word does not occur at all in the Synoptic Gospels with the single exception of Luke xxiv. 48.

It was, however, almost immediately found necessary that the gospel writings should be guaranteed as evidence.

In the mouth of two or three witnesses must every word be established. And so we find "the witness" constantly appealed to throughout the Fourth Gospel and also in Acts.¹

¹ Cf. i. 7, 8, 15, 19, 32, 34; ii. 25; iii. 11, 26, 28, 32, 33; iv. 44; v. 31-34, 36, 37, 39; viii. 13, 14, 17, 18; x. 25; xv. 26, 27; xviii. 37; xix. 35; xxi. 24 (xvii. 8, 21, 23, 25); Acts i. 8, 22; ii. 32; iii. 15; iv. 33; v. 32; x. 39, 41-43; xiii. 31-33; xiv. 3; xv. 8; xxii. 15, 18; xxiii. 11; xxvi. 16, 22, 23, and frequently in the Epistles.

Let us consider first *ἡ μαρτυρία τοῦ Ἰωάννου* (i. 19), concerning which T. H. Robinson in the *EXPOSITOR*, June, 1918, remarks :

"It is not impossible that there circulated in the primitive Church a document known as

‘The Testimony of John,’”

which may be responsible for a large part of the first chapter.

The Evidence passages in chapter i. are as follows :

- Verses 7. αὐτος ἦλθεν εἰς μαρτυρίαν, ἵνα μαρτυρήσῃ . . .
 8. ἀλλ’ ἵνα μαρτυρήσῃ περὶ τοῦ φωτός
 15. Ἰωάννης μαρτυρεῖ περὶ αὐτοῦ . . .
 19. αὕτη ἐστὶν ἡ μαρτυρία τοῦ Ἰωάννου
 32. ἐμαρτύρησεν Ἰωάννης
 34. καὶ γὰρ ἐώρακα, καὶ μεμαρτύρηκα . . .
 cf. xix. 35, καὶ ὁ ἑωρακὼς μεμαρτύρηκε . . .

The Jews were not at all comfortable about the Baptist. (cf. Mt. xxi. 25 ; Mk. xi. 32 ; Lk. xx. 6). Since many of them were inclined to accept him as a prophet indeed, it was desirable that his witness to Jesus should be clear and definite. The Fourth Gospel therefore commences with this witness i. 19.

The Jews themselves are represented as recognising it in iii. 26, 28, v. 33, 36. But what weight can be given to the testimony of the Baptist ? What authority has he to give evidence ? What is the guarantee behind him ? It is certain that such questions would be asked (cf. ii. 18 ; Mt. xxi. 23).

They are met here in the interpolated verses of the Prologue (i. 7, 8, 15) and in the Old Testament quotation i. 23.

It was for this very purpose the Baptist came. He came—God sent him—“for witness,” his work was “to bear testimony.” But to whom ? and what can his testi-

mony be said to guarantee ? Does he testify to what the writer of the gospel believes ? Has there been any deliberate attempt to bring his evidence into direct relation with the purpose of the author ?

The witness of the Baptist is offered :

1. To the Jerusalem embassy (i. 19-27).

This is very vague. It is little more than a personal disclaimer. There standeth among them one whom they know not. This is emphasised by the Old Testament quotation. The Baptist is only the "runner before," the "road-clearer" for Him. It is not said here that He shall baptize. Nothing is said of Him except that he (the Baptist) is not worthy to unloose the latchet of His shoe.

In verse 27 R.V. places the words *ὁς ἔμπροσθεν μου* in the margin, & B C¹ L omit them. They were probably inserted in A C² from *vv.* 15, 30.

2. To the people ? (i. 29-34).

This is much stronger. It opens at once with the peculiar identification : *ὁ ἀπὸς τοῦ θεοῦ ὁ αἰῶν τῇ ἀμαρτίᾳ τοῦ κόσμου.*

In verse 30 this appears to be applied to the person referred to in verse 27, and in 32 to be identified with Him upon whom the Baptist saw the Spirit descending and abiding. This implies the acceptance of the Synoptic account of the baptism of Jesus, since it is not related here that a dove or the Spirit descended, though verse 34 has no support in the Synoptic record nor indeed here.

It is twice stated (31-33) that the Baptist "knew Him not" until the express revelation (33) ascribed to Him who sent John to baptize "*in water*" (mentioned three times, 26, 31, 33). But after all this revelation says nothing of Jesus except that, in contrast to the emphasis laid on water in the baptism of John, "He baptizeth in Holy Spirit." Verse 34 states definitely that this same He is the Son of

God, though there is no previous mention of "the seeing" or of "the evidence" said to have been given unless this title "Son of God" is regarded as merely equivalent to what was said in *ev.* 26, 27, 29, 33. The reading of *Σ.* Syr., v.l., etc., "the chosen one of God," is important, supplying the only apparent justification for Andrew's statement (verse 41): "We have found the Messias."

3. To his own disciples (i. 35-37).

Simply "Behold the Lamb of God" without the addition in 29.

What then does the witness of the Baptist amount to? He points to One greater than himself, whose forerunner he is. He calls Him "The Lamb of God" (bearing the sin of the world). In verse 30 he calls Him simply *Ἀνὴρ*. Jesus uses this word of Himself in *viii.* 40 (cf. Acts ii. 22, etc.). He twice states that he did not know Him till informed by a special revelation (cf. Matt. iii. 13-15).¹ This special revelation (33) does not state that He is "the Son of God" or "the Lamb of God" but mentions a descent of the Spirit upon Him in form (or in the act of descent?), as a dove, as the sign² by which the Baptist is to know that it is He — *ὁ βαπτίζων ἐν Πνεύματι Ἀγίῳ* (cf. Matt. iii. 11; Mark i. 8; Luke iii. 16; and Acts i. 5). In spite of this it is said in *iv.* 2 that Jesus Himself baptized not (but cf. iii. 22, 26).

The conception of baptizing in Holy Spirit is as unique as is the title "Lamb of God," though apparently it convinces the Baptist, whose baptism is only in water, that He is the Son of God (34). There is no direct testimony given

¹ Does this imply a denial of the Lucan infancy narrative? Cf. Headlam, *Life and Teaching of Jesus the Christ*, p. 147. Dr. Headlam also says (p. 153), "that in it (the fourth Gospel), the baptism of John is entirely subordinated to his witness."

² It is only the other Gospels that tell us when or how this took place, although in 34 here the Baptist says "I have seen." The Synoptics seem to suggest that the vision was only seen by Jesus.

that Jesus is the Messiah, and only indirect if it be found in the Old Testament quotation (23) where the Hebrew is of course משיח, or in the reading "the chosen one of God" referred to above.

Bousset, "Jesus" (p. 4), considers that it was only when imprisoned that belief dawned on the Baptist's soul that Jesus might be "he that should come," Messiah.

Certainly Matthew xi. 3 is very difficult if a special revelation had been given to John, although, as has been said, this special revelation does not appear to refer to the Messiah in any way. There is no evidence that Messiah was expected to baptize, though verse 25 here seems to suggest that either he *or Elias or the prophet* might do so.

It is at least, then, very doubtful whether the witness given by John covers the recognition of Jesus as Messiah (cf. i. 41).

Whether the conception "Son of God" (34) is intended to be a higher one than that of Messiah is also uncertain. It seems probable that verse 34 is an attempt on the part of the writer of the Gospel to bring the witness of the Baptist, which is inadequate for his special object, into line with the rest of the Gospel. This probability is greatly increased by comparison with xix. 35. There is nothing, after all, in the "witness of John" which transcends the Old Testament standpoint, and Christ declares (v. 36) that He had "greater witness than that of John." (H. R. Reynolds (*Hast. B.D.* ii.)

Let us pass on to what would probably have been considered the weightiest evidence of all at that time and by the Jews.

What saith the Scriptures? (cf. esp. v. 39). It is quite clear to us that it was of primary importance in the primitive Church to be able to adduce the witness of the Old Testament (cf. esp. Paul in I Cor. xv., "according to the Scrip-

tures"). So necessary was this found to be that zeal often outran discretion, and the multiplication of weak or indeed utterly inadequate evidence from this source¹ tended to discredit and vitiate the good evidence, as it does to-day when zeal is still very often not according to knowledge.

So many times is this witness appealed to in the Fourth Gospel that it is only possible here to give a list of the references.²

A further witness sought for, and to some extent admitted, would be that of Jesus Himself. "What sayest thou of thyself?" Our Gospel offers an answer to this demand, iii. 11, 12; viii. 13f. If personal verbal testimony is insufficient other evidence can be offered, v. 36; x. 25; xii. 17. It is worth notice how Jesus Himself is made to gather the evidence together in v. 31-46, a very striking passage, which only want of space prevents our transcribing here. The possible objection is met: "Though I tell you what I know and have seen, ye will not credit my evidence" (iii. 11; viii. 14; cf. Luke iv. 22), and leads up to the final appeal to the highest evidence, even to that which is infallible, v. 32, 37; viii. 18; cf. Romans i. 9.

Later still this demand for evidence, which has grown stronger as the various gospel writings appeared, is summed up and met in the great passage I John v. 6-11; Jesus having already said that the coming Spirit of Truth shall bear testimony (John xv. 26).

Enough has been said to show how natural and how modern the Jews were in their demand for evidence and how

¹ Esp. many of the references in the Apostolic Fathers.

² For the appeal to the Scriptures in the Fourth Gospel, cf. i. 23, 45; ii. 17, 22; iii. 14; v. 39, 45-47; vi. 14, 32, 45; vii. 19, 22, 38; viii. 5, 17; ix. 28, 29, 34, 35; xii. 14, 16, 34, 38-41; xiii. 18; xv. 25; xvii. 12; xix. 24, 28, 36, 37; xx. 9; no less than 14 of these are by Jesus Himself. For Peter and Paul, cf. Acts iii. 18; x. 43; xxvi. 22, 23; cf. also Heb. x. 15; Lk. xxiv. 27, 44.

this quite reasonable requirement was specially met in the fourth and last Gospel, where the following evidence is expressly offered.

1. John the Baptist.
2. The Author, xix. 35 ; xxi. 24 ; ? i. 34.
3. The Scriptures.
4. Jesus Himself. *a.* His words. *β.* His works.
5. The Father.
6. The Spirit of Truth.

And in 1 John. The Spirit. God Himself.

It is difficult to conceive what more could have been asked or given.

The Fourth Gospel, then, was offered as guaranteed evidence with the express object of impelling belief, as is indeed actually stated by the writer (xx. 31) and was purposely designed to remove a natural objection not met by the Synoptic writers. These two points—Object and Evidence—are the two keys which alone can open the Gospel to our understanding. They may be applied especially to the following intricate locks :

The Miracles.

The Jerusalem Ministry as against the Galilean.

The style and content of the Teaching.

Supplements and Alternatives to the Synoptic record.

It may be possible in a later paper to see something of the effect of this application.

HENRY C. TOWNSEND.

THE HISTORICAL BACKGROUND OF THE DEUTERO-ISAIAH.

II.

IT is an exceedingly difficult task to form even an approximate estimate of the number of Jews who were altogether transported to Babylonia. Unfortunately, we have diverse statements on this subject in 2 Kings xxiv. 14, where the number of captives is given as 10,000, which is probably given as a round number, and in *v.* 16 where the inclusive number is more precisely stated as 8,000. This number, however, only applies to the earlier capture of and deportation from Jerusalem (in the year 597 B.C.). When we turn to the late historical appendix to Jeremiah's writings, chapter lii. 28-30, the figures are altogether different. All that we can infer from the latter passage is that the number of Jews deported in the final capture and destruction of Jerusalem with its temple in 586 was far less. We might therefore state the total number of exiled Jews as about 10,000. This, however, is an estimate which only deals with *males*. If women and children are to be included, we must multiply that number by at least four or five. It would hardly be an extravagant estimate if we assume that 45,000 or even 50,000 captives were transported to the plains of Babylonia. This is fairly in accord with the conclusions at which Edward Meyer arrived in 1896.¹

The term captivity, however, as a description of their condition in Babylonia is certainly misleading. They were

¹ *Entstehung des Judenthums*, pp. 108-113.

not prisoners of war, captured after some military engagement, and interned in a foreign country under strict surveillance and segregated in a limited space. The letter from Jeremiah to the Jewish exiles in Babylonia, to which I referred in the preceding lecture (p. 256), shows that this was very far from being a true picture of their lot, which was, in fact, a far from unpleasant one. They settled down in the land with wives and children, and cultivated the soil as colonists, rather than prisoners of war. The only exceptions to this were (1) Jehoiachin, who was carried away in the earlier deportation, and was released from captivity in 561, on the accession of the Babylonian monarch Evil-Merodach, after the death of Nebuchadrezzar, and (2) the unfortunate and blinded Zedekiah who died in prison (Jer. liii. 11).

The Jews, in general, were free to move as they pleased, buy and sell, and make their living by trade or agriculture. Among the spots where they settled in Babylonia was Tell-Abib, near the river Chebar (Ezek. iii. 15), the river Chebar being probably one of the innumerable canals which communicated with the Euphrates, to which Ezekiel frequently refers (Ezek. i. 3, x. 15). We have also mention in Ezra viii. 15-17, which was composed long after this time, of Casiphia and Ahava. We do not know whether these Jewish settlements were scattered over Babylonia or whether they were placed in close contiguity to one another. On the whole, the latter seems more probable. From Ezekiel xiii. 9, where reference is made to a "register of the house of Israel," which affords an interesting glimpse of the social condition of the exiled Jews at the beginning of the exile, and again from Ezra viii. 1-17, where we have a list given to us of the families of those who went up from Babylonia to the home-land more than 120 years later, we may derive the inference that the Jewish communities managed to hold

together and maintain something of a social solidarity even in exile.

It is, of course, quite true that it might be urged by some critics that in quoting Ezra I am standing on very doubtful historical ground. Even so judicious and sound a scholar—conservative rather than advanced—as the late Professor Driver held that the books of Ezra and Nehemiah, like the books of Chronicles, were edited in their present form not earlier than 250 B.C., i.e., nearly 200 years after the events which they describe. Nevertheless, the careful and minute investigations of Edward Meyer in his monograph, *Die Entstehung des Judenthums*,¹ have clearly shown that the cavalier and *a priori* rejection of the historic credibility of the book of Ezra is unscientific. Meyer admits that the Chronicler has inserted elements of no historical worth into the structure of the work, yet defends the genuineness of the documents and original memoirs on which Ezra iv.–vii. are based. To discuss the subject would lead me aside from my main purpose. All that I am at present concerned to show is that in spite of the powerful disintegrating influences that must have confronted the Jewish communities living in exile, they were still able to maintain their integrity. As in the old days, they lived in families and were ruled by elders or sheikhs, and on more than one occasion these elders came to Ezekiel to “inquire of the Lord” (Ezek. viii. 1; xx. 1).

It is now time for us to take note of the world of Babylonia itself that lay around these small Jewish communities. I shall dwell chiefly on Babylonian religion and on the magic and divination so closely bound up with the religion. The cuneiform documents enable us to carry our investigations on this subject to a far earlier date—not far short of 2000

¹ A very brief reference will be found in Driver's *Lit. of the Old Test.*, 8th ed., p. 552.

years earlier than it is possible to carry out our researches into the earliest sources of Hebrew religion. The evidence before us seems to warrant the conclusion that the cuneiform system of writing and much of both religion and civilisation belonged to a non-Semitic race called Sumerians, who spoke a quite distinct language of their own. But, as Jastrow has pointed out, it is a difficult and perilous task to disentangle the Semitic and non-Semitic elements which from very early times grew up together.¹

The Babylonian deities were like those of Canaan, very largely *local*, i.e., each city had its local patron-deity, and while many deities were worshipped, each town had a chief deity, and with its growth in importance, the prestige and position of its patron-deity in the pantheon would grow with it. In this way, religion and politics grew up together.² At Lagash, an old Sumerian town, the chief deity was Nin-girsu, a solar deity; at Nippur, a very ancient religious centre, the chief deity was Enlil, a deity of storm like Ramman or Adad; at Cuthah, it was Nergal, also a Sun-deity, but representing the destructive power of the Sun; hence we also frequently find Nergal as a ruler of the Lower World. Another ancient city, Ur (or Uru), had for its patron-deity the Moon-God Sin. On the other hand, the town Sippar, the Sepharvaim of the Old Testament, had as its ruling deity the Sun-God Shamash, a Semitic deity

¹ *Religious Belief and Practice in Babylonia and Assyria*, pp. 5 seq. Sumer, it may be remarked, is the Hebrew Shinar, as Schrader pointed out long ago. *Cuneiform Inscr. and the Old Test.*, pp. 103 seq., on Gen. xi. 1.

² The importance of the local temple is well illustrated by Dr. Johns in his work on *Babylonian and Assyrian Laws, etc.*, p. 186. "We find the temples as owners of vast estates and, like monastic institutions in the Middle Ages, letting lands and houses. To the temples poor men went for temporary accommodation for sowing, for wages in harvest time and for ransom from the enemy. There they had a right by custom to receive without paying interest. Undoubtedly the temples became the first centres of progressive civilization. The *patesi*, as chief priest of the god, was the regent of the community."

with a Semitic name, familiar in Hebrew as Shemesh, worshipped at Beth-Shemesh, a Canaanite town.

I have left to the last the great capital of Babylonia, Babel, or Babylon, with its Semitic name Bab-ilu, or Gate of God. This city attained to considerable pre-eminence under the reign of the great ruler and legislator Hammurabi; and its chief deity Marduk (in Hebrew Merodach) came to acquire a corresponding pre-eminence, and acquired the title of *Bél*, which is nothing else than the Semitic Hebrew word *Ba'al* or Lord, the head of the entire Pantheon of Babylonian deities. Marduk was in reality a Sun-God, a centre of a great mythology to which I shall have to refer later on. As might be expected, the most important building in the city is the temple of its patron-deity. Alongside of it are smaller sanctuaries within the sacred enclosure in which other gods or goddesses are worshipped.

The king is always closely associated with the patron-deity of his capital. This was in fact inevitable, for, in the ancient world of which we are speaking, religion interpenetrated daily life at every point, and the king, as the head of the state, was held to be the patron-deity's *shaknu*, viceroy and priest (*ishippu* or *ishshakku*). These are titles which the Assyrian king, Tiglath-Pileser I. (1100 B.C.) assumes. Another calls himself Narām-Sin, "favourite of the god Sin; another designates himself offspring (*binutū*) of the deity.¹ To all this Old Testament parallels at once suggest themselves. Even Saul, by no means an ideal monarch, is reverently called by David "the Lord's anointed," whose person as such was sacrosanct (1 Sam.

¹ Nebuchadrezzar, in the great stone-plate inscription at the East India House, calls himself *mīgār Marduk patesi giri narām Nabium*, "favourite of Marduk, exalted high-priest, beloved of Nebo." The term *patesi* is equivalent to the Semitic word for High Priest *ishshakku*. (Schrader, *Keilinschr. Bibl.*, iii., 2, p. 10).

xxiv. 6, 10 ; 2 Sam. i. 14). We recall the language of Psalms ii. 6-7 :

Yet have I set my king
Upon my holy hill Zion . . .
The Lord said unto me : Thou art my son,
This day have I begotten thee.¹

It is therefore in consonance with this close relation of the monarch to the patron-deity of the state that both in Jerusalem and in Assyria and Babylonia the royal palace was in close conjunction with the temple.

The inscriptions of Nebuchadrezzar are more closely occupied with his buildings than with his military expeditions. In fact, we are imperfectly informed about the latter. But his records clearly show him to have been a great builder who did much to beautify his capital Babylon, and specially devoted himself to the restoration and adornment of temples, both in Babylon, Borsippa, Sippar and elsewhere. In fact, as you read through 60 pages of transcription and translation, by the late Dr. Hugo Winckler, of Nebuchadrezzar's inscriptions of Vol. III., part 2, of Schrader's great cuneiform library it is with these building operations we have to do almost *ad nauseam*. It is to this Nebuchadrezzar, the second king of the Neo-Babylonian Empire, that we owe those far-famed "hanging gardens," a series of raised terraces covered with varied kinds of trees and plants, which both Assyrian and Babylonian, as well as Egyptian monarchs, delighted to accumulate from their foreign conquests, and plant out in gardens and parks. This practice was handed on by the Babylonians to the Persians.²

Nebuchadrezzar did much to make the polytheism of

¹ We even find the Babylonian Narām-Sin called God of Akkad, or the "mighty God of Akkad." (See Hohn, *Die Biblische und die Babylonische Gottesidee*, pp. 333 seq.).

² See art. "Gardens" in the *Encyclopædia Biblica*.

Babylonia stately and attractive; and, among the vivid spectacles which would have greeted the eyes of the exiled Jews who visited Babylon, must have been the sacred street for processions, built by the reigning monarch Nebuchadrezzar, far surpassing in splendour anything the Jew had beheld in Jerusalem. This sacred street was built for processions leading from the temple of Marduk through the city and across the river Euphrates to a suburb called Borsippa, the spot where there was a temple to another great Babylonian deity Nabû or Nebo, whose name forms part of the names of three Babylonian kings of the new empire, including Nebuchadrezzar himself.¹ The close relationship of these two deities was in later times expressed by saying that Nebo was the son of Marduk. As both these deities are specially mentioned in the Deutero-Isaiah, who may not improbably have beheld this sacred street and the solemn function of this sacred procession, we shall have to devote some special attention to them and their cults. Prof. Jastrow has vividly described the scene: "This street along which on solemn occasions the gods were carried in procession was lined with magnificent glazed coloured tiles, the designs on which were lions of almost life-size as the symbol of Marduk. The workmanship belongs to the best era of Euphratean art."²

The conception of a Babylonian or Assyrian temple was that of a house, and in many respects it bore close analogy to the Palestinian temples—including the temple of Solomon. In the first place there was a separate room where the image of the deity stood. This constituted a specially sacred abode—the most sequestered part—the *naós*, or in Hebrew-Canaanite *dēbhîr*, known to us best as "holy of holies,"

¹ Nabopolassar (Nabû-abla-usur), Nebuchadrezzar (Nabû-Kudurriusur), and the last king Nabonidus (Nabû-nāïd).

² See further the art. "Babylon" in the *Encyc. Biblica*, by Dr. Pinches.

or most holy place. Only priests or kings could enter there. Between this and the court where the worshippers assembled there was an interval or enclosure which formed a boundary between the two. Beyond this second court, where the worshippers met together, there was another *outer* court, where the business affairs connected with the temple were transacted. Around both these courts were the apartments of the priests, and the schools, where were taught the methods of divination, and the incantation rituals for exorcising demons, as well as astrology and the drawing up of legal documents and the writing of cuneiform. Nothing illustrates more completely than the Babylonian temple and its buildings how deeply the priest and his religion dominated the life of the country. In fact, each temple contained a great library—a storehouse of cuneiform tablets, astrological, ritual, and mythological, as well as legal deeds.¹

One characteristic feature of these Babylonian sanctuaries, in the larger towns such as Nippur or Borsippa, was a brick tower consisting of two or even as many as seven superimposed and receding stages. This was called a *zikkurat*. It is this tower which forms the historic kernel of that account of the tower of Babel in Genesis xi., and these *zikkurats* may be found in Mohammedan countries even now, and under this name. Some, indeed, surmise that the *masjid* or “mosque” originates from the *zikkurat*. What this *zikkurat* originally represented it is hard to say. Perhaps Jensen, Lagrange and Jastrow are right in their surmise that it represented a mountain on which God was believed to reside, like Yahweh on Mount Sinai. We recall

¹ It must be remembered that all laws of a country, whether Babylonian or Israelite, were regarded as decrees of the deity. On the top of the diorite stone which contains the laws of Hammurabi in 4,000 lines, we have a figure of Hammurabi, who is entitled “king of righteousness,” receiving these laws from the Sun-God Shamash, the supreme God of Justice. We might compare the law-giver Moses receiving from Yahweh on Sinai the two tables of the law.

the fact that the Syrians attributed their defeats in central Palestine to the fact that Yahweh was a god of the hills (1 Kings xx. 23).

The Babylonian deities were invoked in hymns which present striking analogies to our Hebrew Psalms, especially in the feature of parallelism, or again in the characteristic of repetition of phrase or refrain like that of Psalm cxviii., "For his mercy endureth for ever." This latter feature of a repeated phrase is especially frequent in "litanies" or magical incantations, of which we have a very great number in ancient Babylonia. In fact a large proportion of these hymns or prayers in Babylonia are of this nature. They are mostly incantations. A far smaller number are Psalms of thanksgiving or praise or have a festal character. One such I will cite from Zimmern's rendering.¹ This is a hymn addressed to Marduk, or Bel (Lord), on the occasion of the New Year's or *Akitu* festival, when the solemn procession already described along the sacred street of Babylon took place on the 1st of Nisan.

"Up—pass forth, O Bel (Lord)—The king is awaiting thee
Up—pass forth, our Belet (Lady)—The king is awaiting thee
Bel is passing from Babylon—The lands bow before him
Zarpanit² is passing forth—one kindles herbs in full fragrance.
Tashmit³ is passing forth—one kindles vessels of incense with
full cypresses. (MS. p. 35.)

On the flute the *Assinu*-priest and the *Kurgaru*-priest
They play—yea, they play."

One has to imagine the procession of deities carried

¹ *Babylonische Hymnen u. Gebete in Auswahl*, by Heinrich Zimmern (in *Der Alte Orient* series), p. 9.

² Sarpanitu is the female consort deity of Marduk and appears to represent the early morning Sun or dawn (like Greek *ροδοδάκτυλος* "Eos or Aurora). Comp. Jensen in *Zeit. f. Assyr.* VI, p. 153. In later days we find Ishtar goddess of the planet Venus regarded as Marduk's consort, who is also mentioned in this hymn, see Zimmern in *Keil. u. d. Alte Test.*, 3rd ed., p. 375.

³ Tashmit is the consort-goddess of Nebo (Nabû); Zimmern, *op. cit.*, p. 403.

along the sacred street of Babylon—each deity being named as it appears borne from its sanctuary while incense is burnt in their honour and the flutes are played.

It is impossible within the range of these lectures to do more than touch very briefly on this stately pantheon of Babylonian deities. I have not mentioned Ashur, the patron-god of Assyria, as this does not specially concern us in considering *Babylonian* religion, though Babylonian and Assyrian religion might be regarded as, in the main, one system. Ashurbanipal, the last king of importance in Assyria, took special pains in having the religious texts, preserved in Babylonian sanctuaries, copied out and stored in his great library placed in his palace in Nineveh, the remains of which were found at Kuyundjik, opposite Mosul. It is to the tablets found in this ruined library that we owe so much of what we now know of the religion and mythology of ancient Babylonia as well as Assyria.

In early times we find in Babylonia a supreme triad of deities: En-lil (or with assimilation of the *n* in Semitic *Ellil*), god of the atmosphere or storm, patron-deity of Nippur; *Anu*, god of heaven or sky; and *Ea*, god of the water-depth. But when Babylon grew to such supreme importance, its local deity Marduk, god of the early spring Sun, grew to like predominance, and by those methods of mythological adaptation familiar to the priesthoods, was held to be the son of Ea, whose place of worship was, as befits an ocean deity, situated near the sea, at Eridu in South Babylonia.

It is in the great mythological Epic of the Creation of the World that we find Marduk elevated into his exalted place as the creator of the universe. The epic is recorded in seven tablets, the main subject of which is the conflict between the higher gods, deities of light and order, with the dragon-goddess of the dark ocean-depth, Tiâmat, and

her rebellious confederates. The first tablet, which is badly damaged, relates the rise of the rebellion. In the second tablet Anshar, who belongs to the earliest (in reality the second) generation of the gods, hears of Tiâmat's rebellion and summons Anu, god of heaven, his son, to fight against her, and Kingu, her eldest son among the gods, and the leader of her forces. In the second and third tablets the story is lengthened out by a great deal of repetition which makes condensation easy.¹ The god Anu is terrified by the appearance of Tiâmat. So he summons Ea, god of wisdom and of the water-depths, to lead the attack, but Ea also retires, and after much parley among the gods, who drink sweet mead and become intoxicated,² Marduk, son of Ea, is made the leader of the hosts against the dragon-goddess.

The fourth tablet narrates the struggle. Lines 35 sqq. give a vivid description of Marduk's preparation for the fight.

“ He shaped a bow, made it as his weapon,
 carried a javelin, made it a defence,
 lifted up the club, grasped it in his right-hand.
 Bow and quiver he bound to his side.
 He set a lightning flash before his face.
 With a glowing flame he filled his body (*zumurshau*).
 Made ready a net to catch Tiâmat therein.
 Posted (?) the four winds so that naught of her might escape.”

These terrible winds are then described, after which (line 50) :

¹ In this we are reminded of the Iliad and Odyssey, but in the Babylonian epic the repetition far exceeds anything in Greek literature.

² Tablet III., lines 132 seq. :—

“ They kissed one another in the assembly . . .
 Entertained one another, sat down at the banquet,
 Ate bread prepared . . . wine.
 The sweet mead intoxicated their senses
 . . . They became very careless (?) their heart was high.
 Marduk's lot—their helper—they determined.”

“ He mounted on the chariot of the storm-wind, the incomparable,
the terrible.”

On the approach of Marduk panic seizes Kingu and his host, but Tiâmat confronts him with a shriek and hurls at him an incantation. Marduk casts around her his net and drives the evil wind into her face, and within her body, seizes his javelin (? trident) and severs her body, and casts away the corpse. After dealing in summary fashion with his remaining adversaries, Marduk returns to the corpse of the dragon-goddess and at the close of the fourth tablet we read (lines 135 sqq.) :

“ He smote it like a flat fish in two parts.
One half he set up and covered therewith the heaven.
He drew a barrier, appointed sentinels.
Not to let forth its water he gave them command.”

Thus out of the body of the dragon-goddess the Universe was fashioned, as it was conceived by the Semites of those days ; the “ barrier ” to which reference is here made, being what the Hebrews called *rākîaʿ* or “ firmament,” which separated between the upper waters which were supposed to lie above the firmament and flowed through openings or “ windows of heaven ” in the form of rain, and the lower waters which were beneath the firmament.¹

The Epic closes in the seventh tablet, with praise of Marduk (lines 125 sqq.) :

¹ *Tablet V.*, lines 1 sqq. describe the creation of the celestial bodies. I quote from Dr. Johns' rendering (in a printed paper) :

- Line 1 He made the stations for the great gods.
- 2 The stars, their likenesses, in constellations he placed.
- 3 He appointed the year, divided in sections,
- 4 For each of the twelve months he set three stars.

Tablet VI., lines 1 sqq. describe the creation of man as purposed by Marduk and declared by him to Ea :

- Line 5 My blood will I gather and bone will I form.
- 6 I will cause man to stand, man shall be . . .
- 7 I will create man to dwell on the earth,
- 8 That the service of God may be established.

"Let one hold it fast and let the ancient teach it,
 Wise and learned ponder it together.
 Let the father tell it to the son and cause him to know it,
 Let the ears of ruler and guardian be open,
 Let him rejoice over the ruler of gods, Marduk.
 May his land be fruitful and he well portioned.
 Faithful is His word, unfailing His command.
 The utterance of His mouth has a god never changed.
 He looks fearlessly on without turning his back.
 When He rages, no god can withstand His anger.
 Far and wide His heart careth, great is His goodness."

These concluding lines clearly reflect the loftier ethical and spiritual traits which may be discerned both in Egyptian and in Babylonian religion in the hymns and prayers addressed to the higher deities—the gods of light.¹ Let us remember that it was from Shamash, the Sun-God, Hammurabi is depicted as receiving his memorable great code of laws. One of the noblest of hymns is addressed to Shamash :²

"O Lord, enlightener of darkness—revealer of the bright countenance,
 Merciful God, who raisest up the oppressed, protectest the weak,
 For thy light the great gods wait,
 The Anunnaki³ all together gaze on thy countenance,
 Thou guidest the tongues in one accord as though they were one creature.
 With exalted head they gaze at the light of the sun.
 As soon as thou arisest joy and gladness!"

The Epic of Creation, which I have just described, and in which Marduk plays so decisive a part, is of great importance and interest to the Biblical student. There can be little doubt that Marduk, in many respects, exhibits parallels

¹ Notably in the Hymn of Amenhotep IV. (Ikhnaton) to Akhen-Aten, the god of the sun-disc, cited in Breasted's *Hist. of Egypt*.

² IV. Rawl. 19, No. 2, cited by Zimmern in *Bab. Hymnen u. Gebete* and here taken from the rendering in Hehn, *Die Biblische u. die Babylonische Gottesidee*, p. 35.

³ The *Anunnaki* are the gods of earth as opposed to the *Igigi*, gods of heaven.

to the Yahweh of the Hebrews. Moreover, Babylonian myths have their reflex in those of the Old Testament. Take, for example, the Flood-legend.¹ The Babylonian story contained in the eleventh tablet of the Gilgamesh series, in which Ut-Napashtim of Shuruppak, son of Ubara-tutu, corresponds to the Old Testament Noah, bears so many resemblances to the Biblical legend that we are driven to suppose that these closely allied stories result from historic contact. This point of contact was obviously not the exile period, since the Bible story is a duplicate made up of the *pre-exilian* Yahwistic account and the *post-exilian* Priestercodex story interwoven. The Yahwistic story clearly shows that the Hebrews possessed a flood-story *before the exile*.

Notice, again, the legend of Paradise with its names of Euphrates and Tigris, the story of the Tower of Babel, and the reference to Nimrod. All these belong to the pre-exilian document, J. They clearly show that with their Palestinian traits and variations they resulted from that early Babylonian influence which dominated Western Asia to which I alluded in the previous lecture, and these stories became domiciled and developed on Palestinian soil. Prof. Gunkel, in a profoundly interesting monograph (*Schöpfung und Chaos*), has clearly proved that in Israel in early pre-exilian times there must have existed a cosmogonic legend of a conflict between Yahweh, the supreme God of light, and a dragon monster of the deep. Various significant traces of this ancient myth are to be found in pre-exilian Old Testament writings. Thus the prophet Amos, in a strange vision of judgment with which chapter ix. opens, represents Yahweh as standing at the altar of the sanctuary at Bethel, and declaring that His judgment shall even follow those who

¹ The Gilgamesh epic in 12 tablets is well told in L. W. King's interesting book, *Babylonian Religion and Mythology* (1899), pp. 146-176. It gives the reader an excellent idea of the remarkable mythology of Babylonia.

descend into the floor of the sea to conceal themselves, and He will give command to the serpent to bite them. This dragon of the dark water-depths, which were supposed to lie beneath the earth, which floated on them, is variously called Leviathan and *Rahab*.¹ This term *Rahab* is applied by the earlier Isaiah of Hezekiah's time to Egypt, which the prophet contemptuously calls "Rahab the vanquished"—the arrogant yet impotent power which was doomed to be overthrown.

When we come to the Deutero-Isaiah, we find that his Babylonian surroundings and the mythology of the land in which he lived appear to have awakened this old conception within him of Yahweh's conflict with the dragon. On the prophet's lips it is naturally, and for special reasons to be explained hereafter, *Yahweh* and not *Marduk* who wins the victory. Apostrophising the "arm of the Lord" the prophet says (li. 9):

"Bestir thyself, bestir thyself, put on strength—arm of Yahweh.
Bestir thyself as in former times—the ancient generations.
Art thou not it that hewed in pieces Rahab—stabbed the dragon?"

The poet then passes on by a natural transition to connect Rahab with Egypt, and the power of Pharaoh overthrown by Yahweh, when He dried up the waters of the great water-depth for the redeemed to pass over (cf. Ps. lxxvii. 15-19). The echoes of this old myth meet us again in Psalm literature in special connexion with Egypt, as in this passage of the Deutero-Isaiah, which was evidently their model, Ps. lxxiv. 13, lxxxvii. 4, lxxxix. 10 [Heb. 11].

There were doubtless in the ancient Hebrew literature a great many such reminiscences of early Semitic mythology, and occasionally we find it still lurking beneath the language of our Old Testament Scriptures. That old conception of

¹ See the sketch of the Hebrew-Semitic cosmos or universe in the writer's art. "Cosmogony" in Hastings' D.B.

the vast ocean water-depth is preserved in the language of the creation-account in the first chapter of Genesis, which was the beginning of the *post-exilian* document P, succeeded in the following chapter (ii. 4, 6-7) by another and much earlier pre-exilian cosmogony, belonging to the document J. In chapter i. 2 we learn that before God created heaven and earth and separated earth and sea, there was only a vast dark void, and darkness only rested on the great water-depth which is called in Hebrew *Tehôm*, a name closely resembling the name *Tiâmat*.¹ In fact, the opening of the great Babylonian Creation epic is in many points very similar to that of the first chapter of Genesis. But in the *Biblical account* the stern monotheism and spiritual character of the Jew has carefully eliminated all mythological elements that belonged to the old Semitic story preserved in the Babylonian form of the myth and even discernible in the passage I quoted from Isaiah.

I must now pass from Marduk, also called Bel or "Lord," to another important Babylonian deity, Nabû or Nebo. This deity was the patron-god of Borsippa, a town much inferior in size to its powerful neighbour, Babylon, of which Marduk was the chief god. Consequently Nebo is held to be the son of Marduk. The name Nabû is connected with the same root as that of the Hebrew word for prophet (viz. *nābî*). Both are derived from a Semitic root *nabâ*, or *nabû*, meaning to speak or announce. The "prophet" is one who speaks or announces the will of God, and the god Nabû or Nebo possessed this character. He was, as his name signified, the announcer of Divine destiny. He was also regarded as the god of writing, and patron of the

¹ See the diagram illustrating the Semitic-Hebrew conception of the universe sketched by the present writer years ago in art. "Cosmogony" of Hastings' D.B., and since then reproduced in Bennett's "Genesis" (*Cent. Bible*), and Bishop Ryle's "Genesis" (*Camb. Bible for Schools*).

art of writing, and of all the knowledge connected with it. This was due to the position which he held, and the function which he discharged in the pantheon as the Divine Secretary --the god who writes the tablets of destiny and in the main determines destiny. Thus we find Nebo called the "bearer of the tablet of destiny of the gods," "writer of all,"¹ "writer of E-sagil." In a hymn addressed to Nebo Ashurbanipal says, "My life is written before thee."

The planet which represents Nebo is Mercury. And it is significant that this planet came to be associated in the Græco-Roman world with the deity who was regarded as the messenger of the gods. Nebo, though he is usually made subordinate to Marduk as his son, and on the New Year's Day, or *Akitu* festival, placed in a secondary rank as compared with *Marduk* the supreme deity, was nevertheless treated in Babylonia as a god of almost unrivalled pre-eminence. This is clearly evidenced by the remarkable number of Babylonian kings into whose name Nebo enters.² Indeed, there was an Assyrian king, Adadnirâri IV. (810-782 B.C.) who married a Babylonian wife, Sammuramat, or Semiramis, and, probably owing to her influence, made so much of this deity, and heaped upon him so many high attributes, that it is hard to conceive of any higher deity. In one of his invocations he says :

"Whosoever in future shall live, let him trust in Nebo,
In no other God let him trust."

Now this does not mean that Nebo is the sole deity. Other gods are not excluded from worship or reverence, but for the time being Nebo is exalted into this unique pre-eminence. Nor is this apparent contradiction in the attitude of the worshipper peculiar in its reference. Hehn,

¹ *Tupšar gimri*, Sarg. cyl., line 59. See Schrader, *K.I.B.* II., p. 187, note 6, etc.

² No less than seven are mentioned in Hehn's *Biblische u. Babylonische Gottesidee*, p. 68.

in his work on *The Biblical and the Babylonian idea of God*, has called special attention to this feature. In fact, each of the chief Babylonian deities, in turn, is similarly lifted by the worshipper into a position of supreme dignity. Anu, god of heaven, is spoken of as the "entirety of heaven and earth," and yet the worshipper never dreamt for a moment that there was no place in the universe for any other deity. The same attitude is shown by the Babylonian worshipper towards En-lil and towards the Moon-god Sin. In fact Sin, also called Nannar, is regarded by Hammurabi as his creator, the Lord of Heaven, whose brightness gleams among the gods. No doubt the high place of Sin in the Babylonian pantheon was really due to the fact that in a religion that was so largely astral the predominance of the moon among the stars at night gave the Moon-deity his high position. In fact, a hymn addressed to him begins with the words :

"Lord, ruler of gods, who alone art exalted in heaven and on earth."

The fourth strophe of this hymn is particularly significant :

"When thy word, thine, resounds in heaven, the *Igigi* fall upon their face ;

When thy word, thine, resounds on earth, the *Amunnaki* kiss the ground."

Sin in fact is incomparable in greatness.

"Lord in heaven in Lordship—on earth in rule.

Thou hast among the gods, thy brethren, no rival ;

King of kings exalted, against whose behest no one approaches,
Whose godhead no god resembles."¹

This, of course, may be partly set down to Oriental extravagance, or the same Oriental obsequiousness that may be seen in so many of those despatches of the Egyptian Palestinian governors to the Pharaoh, which may be read in the Tell el-Amarna tablets, in which the King of Egypt

¹ Hehn, *op. cit.*, pp. 30-33.

is called "my God, my Sun."¹ But while this may be partly true, it is, by itself, an inadequate explanation, because it does not account for all the facts. It would be more true to say that these traits in the hymns of adoration are due to a certain tendency or drift towards monotheism—a tendency, no more which may be found in Egyptian religion as well as Babylonian, notably in the effort of Amenhotep IV., about 1380 B.C., to make the worship of the sun-disc, Akhen-Aten, the exclusive cult of Egypt—a movement which proved his ruin.

In later days, the reflective spirits among the priesthoods of Babylonia strove to effect an absorption of all deities as quasi-hypostatic expressions of the one supreme God, Marduk. There is scarcely any Babylonian document that can exceed in interest one that came to light in the early part of this century which, as Jastrow tells us, was a Neo-Babylonian copy of an older text.²

"Ea (Uresh) is the Marduk of planting.

Ninib is the Marduk of strength.

Nergal is the Marduk of war.

Zamama³ is the Marduk of battle.

En-lil is the Marduk of sovereignty and counsel.

Nebo is the Marduk of acquisition.

Sin is the Marduk of the illumination of the night.

Shamash is the Marduk of justice.

Adad is the Marduk of rain."

Other three identifications with obscure deities follow. Marduk is thought of as absorbing into himself the characters and functions of all other gods. This is certainly a definite movement in the direction of monotheism, though it is not monotheism consummated and perfected.

¹ "Seven and yet seven times I bow . . . I am dust beneath the shoe of my Lord the King." These phrases occur repeatedly in these letters *ad nauseam*.

² Jastrow, *Religion in Babylonia and Assyria*, p. 102.

³ Zamama appears to be another manifestation of Ninib as god of war. On pp. 58-62 Hehn discusses the interpretation of this in many respects difficult text.

The last of the deities of Babylonia to which I shall refer is Ishtar, the goddess of sexual love and reproduction. Her cult was more wide-spread among the Semitic races than that of any other deity. She is the Ashtart (with the feminine *t* ending), conventionally pronounced Ashtōreth, of the Canaanites and the Hebrews (who adopted her cult), as well as the Athtar of the South Arabians. The Hebrews, as we know from the historical books of the Old Testament, as well as from the oracles of Jeremiah, were only too familiar with the rites of this cult of Ashtart and its licentious accompaniments. The productivity of animals was connected with her divine influence. Hence we meet with a curious word in the Book of Deuteronomy for the young offspring of flocks, viz. *Ashtārōth*; and the same conception meets us in the epic of the "Descent of Ishtar to Hades." After the disappearance of Ishtar into the Lower World, the Sun-god Shamash goes weeping to Sin the Moon-god who is father of Ishtar, declaring that since Ishtar had vanished from earth the normal relations of male to female among all the animals of the world had absolutely ceased.¹

Probably the worship of Ashtart, who was goddess of the planet Venus, received a considerable impulse among the Palestinian Jews during the reign of the degenerate king Manasseh, who was the vassal of Assyria, and cultivated star-worship, or in the words of 2 Kings xxi. 3, "worshipped all the host of heaven." Accordingly, we read in the oracles of Jeremiah that the women of Jerusalem kneaded dough, and made from it cakes or wafers (*kawwānīm*) as offerings for Ashtoreth, the queen of heaven (Jer. vii. 18).² Chapters

¹ See the version of the Descent of Ishtar to Hades in translation in Gressmann's *Altorientalische Texte u. Bilder zum A. T.*, pp. 65-67 (see esp. lines 85-92).

² The Massoretic Hebrew reading "work of heaven" is just one among numerous examples of the redactorial efforts of the scribes to eliminate offensive idolatrous references, or modify them in the old text. "Queen of heaven" is unquestionably the correct reading. The fullest article on Ashtoreth is that of the late Prof. Driver in *Hastings' D.B.* vol. i.

ii.-iv. in Jeremiah's oracles are full of clear evidences of the extent to which, in spite of the Deuteronomic reformation, the Canaanite cults had penetrated the Judæan life in Palestine. Ashtart-worship continued to prevail especially among the Jewish women, and after the terrible overthrow of Jerusalem had come, and Yahweh's temple been destroyed, and a remnant of its population accompanied by Jeremiah had taken refuge in Egypt, a violent controversy arose between a large number of these women-devotees of Ashtart and Jeremiah.

These Jewish women took a diametrically opposed view of Judah's misfortunes to that which Jeremiah enunciated. The passage (which comes from Baruch's biographical pen) is vivid, as well as instructive. Jeremiah prophesied that destructive evils would come upon those exiles in Egypt on account of their disloyalty to Yahweh. But the women hotly argued for *their* view (xliv. 16-19): "As for the word that thou hast spoken unto us in Yahweh's name, we will not listen unto thee. But we will certainly perform every promise that is gone forth out of our mouth to burn incense unto the Queen of Heaven and to pour out drink offerings unto her, as we have done, we and our fathers, our kings and our princes, in the cities of Judah and in the streets of Jerusalem; and we had plenty of food and were well, and saw no evil. But since we left off to burn incense to the Queen of Heaven, and to pour out drink offerings unto her, we have wanted all things and have been consumed by the sword and by the famine. And when we burned incense to the Queen of Heaven and poured out drink-offerings unto her, did we make her cakes stamped with her portrait and pour out offerings unto her without our husbands?"

Now, this passage is important, because it represents much that was felt or expressed by many of the Jewish exiles, both in Babylonia and Egypt. To this I will return

in the following lecture. There can be no doubt that both the cult and mythology of Ishtar in Babylonia were picturesque and attractive, though in some aspects, the cult, like that of Aphrodite, was licentious and grossly sensual. There is considerable impressiveness in the myth of her Descent into Hades, described in the long poem of 140 lines, in which she passes through the seven gates of the Lower World, deprived at each gate of separate articles, both ornaments and clothing. The end of the epic is that Ishtar is sprinkled with the water of life and delivers her beloved Tammuz from the lower world. The beautiful myth of Tammuz and Ishtar, which passes into the Adonis and Venus story of classic legend, had a great hold on Palestinian lands, especially at Gebal (or Byblus) in Phœnicia, and we know from Old Testament sources how the rite of weeping for Tammuz prevailed among Palestinian Jews.¹

Ishtar, in Babylonian cults and mythology, presents many aspects beside that of the voluptuous goddess like Aphrodite of many amours. On this large subject I can only refer you to Prof. Langdon's interesting and somewhat speculative monograph called "Tammuz and Ishtar." In the earliest form Ishtar is a mother-goddess representing earth, and Tammuz is her son. We constantly find her among the Assyrians represented as a war-goddess, and she is, moreover, distributed into various local personalities. Ashurbanipal in his great cylinder-inscription invokes her as Ishtar of Nineveh, and as Ishtar of Arbela, among the various deities to whom he appeals before his war-expeditions. Ishtar, with bow and sword and a quiver on her shoulder, appears to him in a dream and declares: I will walk before Ashurbanipal, the king.

But Ishtar presents other more genial and nobler aspects

¹ "Women weeping for Tammuz," in Ezekiel viii. 14, were seen by the prophet in the precincts of the Jerusalem temple.

of deep love and compassion for men. She is the goddess invoked by suffering men in their penitential Psalms. One such is cited by Prof. Langdon in his *Tammuz and Ishtar* (p. 63) :—

“Thou renderest the judgment of mankind with judgment and right,
Thou lookest upon the despised and settest right the down-trodden every day.
How long wilt thou tarry, Queen of heaven and earth, shepherdess of pale-faced men ?
How long wilt thou tarry, O Queen of Eanna, that consecrated treasure-house and pure ?
How long wilt thou tarry, O Queen, whose feet are not weary, whose knees hasten ?”

A long prayer of 105 lines of invocation to Ishtar has been translated by King and Zimmern ; I will quote one brief extract :¹

“How long, O my mistress, shall my enemies pursue after me ?
With persecution and untruths,—plan evil ?
Shall my pursuer, my enemy,—lie in wait for me ?
How long, my lady, shall the abject, the cripple lord it over me ?

The weak have become strong, I however have become weak.
I surge like a high flood—that stirs up an evil wind,
My heart flies and flutters—like a bird of the heaven,
I moan like a dove—night and day,
Am cast down—and weep in anguish,
For sorrow and sighing—my spirit is full of pain.
What have I done, my god and my goddess—I ?
'Tis as though I feared not my god and my goddess.

Disease and sickness have come over me—ruin and destruction,
Over me have come distress, averting of the face and fulness of wrath,

Rage, anger, fury of gods and men ;
I must behold, lady, dark days, gloomy months, years of misfortune ;

I must behold, my lady, a judgment of confusion and indignation (?)

Death and Distress take hold on me.”

¹ See L. W. King, *The Seven Tablets of Creation*, I., pp. 231 sqq. Zimmern, *Hymnen u. Gebete*.

And so the sad plaint goes on till the final appeal :

“ May my prayer and mine appeal come nigh unto thee !
 Thy great compassion become my portion . . .
 Yea, Ishtar is exalted—yea, Ishtar is queen,
 My lady is exalted—my lady is queen ! ”¹

OWEN C. WHITEHOUSE.

ON THE PRESENT POSITION OF OLD TESTAMENT CRITICISM.²

THE subject selected is an ambitious one for an inaugural lecture before a non-academic audience, and can only be briefly treated. It also runs the risk of becoming highly technical : and you will not count me impertinent if I say that, in consideration of the audience, I have been diligent to avoid technicalities. The ambitious and technical character of the task makes it more difficult ; but on that it is unnecessary to linger, for I have noticed that every audience

¹ Another example of confession for sin is given in L. W. King's *Babylonian Religion and Mythology* (1899), p. 212 :

“ O my God, who art angry, accept my prayer.
 O my Goddess, who art angry, receive my supplication,
 Receive my supplication and let thy spirit be at rest.
 O my Goddess, look with pity on me and accept my supplication,
 Let my sins be forgiven, let my transgressions be blotted out.
 Let the ban be torn away, let the bonds be loosened.
 Let the seven winds carry away my sighs.
 I will rend away my wickedness, let the bird bear it to the
 heavens.” . . .

² This paper was originally prepared and delivered as an inaugural address at the opening of a New College Session. Incomplete reports of its contents came into circulation, and roused some interest, as well as led to misunderstanding. Accordingly it is here published in full, and opportunity has been taken to add further illustrations and proofs of the positions which were originally advanced. The form of an address has, however, been retained, were it only because its retention has kept steadily before the writer that what was advanced was meant for other than technical students. The paper does not profess to do more than collect and arrange what is thoroughly recognised by most students of the subject. Yet the matter with which it deals is of significance to others than specialists in the Old Testament : and even students may find it of advantage to see well-recognised facts collated.

has the comfortable faculty of enduring the difficulties of a lecturer.

It may, then, be taken for granted that you know generally the view which, during the life-time of us older men, has passed from the position of an extreme heresy into that of a new orthodoxy. But it may be useful to remind you that the modern view rests on three main positions, which are, or may be, regarded as the surest results of modern criticism.

The first is the analysis of Genesis and of the Pentateuch into three main sources, which were afterwards combined into one. The phenomenon which drew attention to the diversity between these, and which is still one of the chief guides in carrying out the analysis, is the differing use of the divine names, Yahweh and Elohim. So large a place did and does this distinction hold in the analysis that two of the sources which are woven together in our present book of Genesis are named respectively the Yahwist and the Elohist.

The second position is that the book of Deuteronomy, if not in its present, at least in its original, form, was first brought to light in 621 under King Josiah, when it was used as the basis for an effort at reform in the national religion. As such, it marked a new departure in the religious life of Judah, especially in connexion with the concentration of worship at the temple of Jerusalem. Certain of its main contentions were therefore wholly novel in the kingdom.

The third position is that Ezra, about 440, pledged the body of returned exiles to a new law-book, the Priestly Code, so called because it transformed the people from a civil to an ecclesiastical community, organised under a high-priest instead of under a king. In particular, it made, for the first time, strict obedience to the whole Levitical law and the qualification of the people for offering sacrifice

the chief *raison d'être* of their existence as a nation. The inevitable result of this changed attitude was a new segregation of the people from all the surrounding nations, which at first expressed itself in the effort to forbid all intermarriage.

Now the theory has always been questioned in many of its details, and modifications in its original statement have been continually made to meet these objections. With these it is unnecessary to deal in such a lecture. But, in particular, increasingly grave objection has been raised against its three cardinal positions. And it may be possible to group these objections and to point out why the theory is now being questioned on fundamental issues. I ask your patience in the attempt to sketch why each of these is seriously shaken.

In connexion with the analysis of the Genesis stories, the question has been raised from two sides as to whether the differing use of the divine names, Yahweh and Elohim, forms a reliable basis for such an analysis. Thus a number of students, such as Möller,¹ have insisted that Yahweh and Elohim are not employed as synonyms in the Old Testament. Elohim is frequently used where we should employ an adjective like divine; Yahweh, on the other hand, often carries the sense of the God of revelation, which, for the Old Testament, means the revelation to the Hebrews. Hence a work of Elohim may simply correspond to what we should call a divine work, while a work of Yahweh may mean what we should name specifically an act of God in revelation, or even in redemption. The contention can be supported by the differing use of the divine names in the later historical books, and there is no ground on which we may deny the possible

¹ *Wider den Bann der Quellenscheidung*. No effort has been made to catalogue all the literature which has appeared on one side and the other of the debate. The attempt has been made, however, to set down the most characteristic utterances in each case.

appearance of such a usage in Genesis. Yet it becomes at once obvious that, if a writer was able to use Yahweh in the special and restricted sense and Elohim in the general sense of divine, he may have used both names in his account and may have passed readily from one to another. So soon, however, as this is recognised, the use of Yahweh or Elohim in any particular passage ceases to be a distinctive thing.

But the question of the use of the divine names has been attacked from another side. For a number of other students, such as Dahse¹ in Germany and Wiener² in London, have raised a much more serious objection, viz., the reliability of the Massoretic Text in its use of Yahweh and Elohim. They have pointed out how often the Septuagint Text differs from the Hebrew in the precise matter of the divine names, and have insisted that, in passages where the usage is at present uniform, the uniformity may not be original. A section may to-day be Yahwistic in character, but its uniform use of one divine name may not be due to the original writer, but may be the result of changes introduced deliberately or *per incuriam*. It is easy to see that a copyist, who began a section with Yahweh, may have continued to employ this form, though his original had no such uniformity.

That such changes could be made and were made, even in connexion with the divine names, that at certain periods, or by certain individuals, one divine name was preferred and substituted for the other, is of course obvious. An entire book of the Psalter exhibits by preference the name Elohim. And that the psalms of the second book were not all originally written in that form is proved through the

¹ *Textkritische Materialien zur Hexateuchfrage.*

² *Essays in Pentateuchal Criticism*, and especially, *The Pentateuchal Text*, a Reply to Dr. Skinner.

appearance of one of its psalms in the double form—the Elohistie and the Yahwistic.¹ The comparative uniformity of the second book of Psalms is the outcome of a deliberate change. Now, since we do not know when the change was made and have no certain clue to the reasons which led to the change, it is impossible to say that such an alteration of the divine names could only be effected in the Psalter. It may have influenced, if not the writers, at least the copyists, of the stories in Genesis.

Both Dahse and Möller have complicated the question and thus have weakened their criticism as criticism by proposing, in place of the ruling hypothesis, their own solutions of the problem of the composition of Genesis. The theories they have proposed are, to say the least, somewhat inconclusive. That of Möller is so unconvincing that it has not called for very serious reply, and Dahse's has been fully, in my judgment conclusively, answered by Dr. Skinner.² But the fact that their counter-theories are found to be unsatisfactory does not diminish, and ought not to be allowed to diminish, the force of the criticism which they have brought against the regnant hypothesis. And Wiener, in particular, has made out a strong case for recognising that the basis on which the entire analysis of Genesis rests, viz., the existing MT of the book, has been lightly accepted without due examination. Whether Wiener himself has a clear counter-theory on the subject or ever accepted that of Dahse I acknowledge myself unable to determine, nor is the matter of any importance here. The chief value of his contribution consists in his clear cross-examination of the defence and in his convincing insistence on its insufficiency. The present Hebrew text of Genesis has been accepted unthinkingly: yet it is the basis of the whole position.

¹ Psalms liii. and lxx.

² *The Divine Names in Genesis.*

It may, of course, be said that too much need not, and ought not, to be made of the difference in the use of the divine names. The distinctive use of Yahweh and Elohim was certainly the factor which, because it was so patent and so easily recognised, first drew attention to the subject, and which long continued to be the chief criterion in distinguishing and separating the different accounts. But the whole question has now been shifted from so narrow a basis, and has come to rest on a much wider foundation. Difference in language, difference in theological attitude, difference in moral and social outlook, have now come in to supplement and correct the original single test. That is perfectly true, and always deserves to be remembered by all who discuss the subject. But it is equally true that several of the other criteria which are employed are apt to suffer from what is the curse of all Old Testament criticism, and which, in the circumstances, must always remain its weakness—the subjective character of the evidence. And it must further be frankly acknowledged that, where the other criteria are employed, they often fail to give any sure result. Certain documents, which are wholly divergent in attitude and outlook, so divergent as to be even contradictory, are only held together by the fact that they all employ the divine name Yahweh. Sometimes, too, reliance on the wider criteria leads to such uncertain results that recourse must be taken to the use of the divine name as the final conclusive evidence of the origin of the passage. Thus, e.g., anyone who consults Dr. Skinner's commentary on Genesis cannot fail to recognise that the early stories on the period prior to the flood are so different in their language, so divergent, indeed so mutually contradictory in their points of view, that the one thing which holds them together is the casual fact that they all employ the name Yahweh. Skinner speaks of the varied character of the sources in a way which

calls to mind the old, exploded, fragmentary theory about the composition of Genesis. Now what is of interest is that here the whole case rests on the single criterion of the common use of one divine name. But what if this common use of the one divine name in these sources rests on an untested M T ?

Again, nowhere might it appear easier and safer to ignore the divine name used and to trust to the larger criteria of language, of ideas, of theological outlook than in connexion with the Priestly Code. There we have to do with a document which is pronounced to belong to a late date in Judaism, when the theological language had been framed and crystallised, and above all when a sharply-marked temper of narrow legalism had taken possession of the leading minds in Jewry. Men rewrote the old stories in order to superinduce on the naïver early views the temper of the scribes. But, when we examine the first such doublet in the story of the flood, we find that the writer is thinking primarily of God's relation to the world, and not of His relation to the chosen race. God to him is the creator of the universe, and also the holy one who finds that His universe has lapsed into sin. For such a God to come into relation to such a world can only mean its destruction : and it has been destroyed with the exception of one righteous man. But, when the world is reconstituted after the judgment, the writer boldly represents the Deity as now taking thought with Himself how He shall in future deal with it. For the evil is still there, it is in the heart of humanity. And God deliberately limits Himself never again to react against His world in the way in which He has done in the flood. His self-limitation is His covenant, on which the human race can rely for all time to come. As such, He guarantees it by a sign which is of His own appointment, and beyond man's power to change or undo. He makes it sure by the natural symbol of the rainbow, something which

endures, at once a reminder to God of how He means to act, and an assurance to mankind of what they may continually expect. In reality, the writer is thinking out along his own lines the ultimate theological problem which troubled the Gnostics : how God can come into contact with a fugitive and sinful world without destroying it or without ceasing Himself to be holy. He could not take the easy solution which satisfied the Gnostics, and commit the world to the charge of a demiurge, while God Himself remained aloof in His untroubled calm. What prevented him from taking this road was not merely his strong Jewish monism, which admitted no demiurge, but was also his recognition that the divine holiness included redemption. To leave the world to a demiurge was to cut the roots of redemption, yet redemption was the one reason why God should come into relation to His world. If God could not come into some real relation to human sin, He could not redeem. The Hebrew was content, as often happens, to fling up sharply the antithesis. God, being holy, cannot come into relation to human frailty except to destroy it : but God does come to redeem. And He does it through His self-limitation. In His covenant, He limits Himself in His reactions against human frailty and sin.

Nothing could well be further away from the narrow limits of late Jewish legalism. But nothing could also better illustrate why the writer was bound to use the divine name, Elohim. He was not thinking of the covenant God of Israel. He was thinking of something prior to the historic relation of Yahweh to Israel, even the relation of God to humanity, though the lines along which he approached the question were supplied by his own specifically Hebrew religion. Möller is wholly justified, when he writes that Elohim is frequently employed "in connexion with those who stand outside the theocracy."

Neither the use of the divine names nor the use of other criteria leads to sure results. And, when the insufficiency of the one method is pointed out, to seek refuge in the other is neither dignified nor convincing. It is better to say frankly that the regnant hypothesis, so far as the analysis of the sources, especially in Genesis, is concerned, has been built up without sufficient attention having been given to its basis—on the one hand, to the reliability of the M T in connexion with the employment of the divine names, on the other hand, to the practice throughout the whole of Scripture in the use of the same names. There is need for renewed, close and unprejudiced examination on both these matters.¹

How then does it fare with the second main position of the theory, the dating of Deuteronomy in the period of Josiah? Here it is necessary to point out merely the general trend of modern study, and to avoid, on the one side, right-hand defections like those of Kennett, and, on the other, left-hand extremes like my own. Here also it is useful to emphasise that what appears as yet is no more than the beginning of what must bring with it larger consequences.

Now it was comparatively easy to assign Deuteronomy to the period of Josiah, so long as the book was taken in its entirety and regarded as a unity.² No one can deny its present homogeneous character: in its present form it is the most homogeneous code in the Old Testament. But the moment the book was studied by itself, and the moment the same principles of historical criticism, which had given rise to the regnant hypothesis, were applied to the study of the individual book, it became evident that this homo-

¹ Cf. Baumgärtel, *Elohim ausserhalb des Pentateuchs*, p. 13 f. B. arrives at practically the same conclusion.

² I exclude all references to the concluding chapters. These were always recognised as foreign elements in the law-book.

geneous character was secondary, and was due to the code having been compiled in pursuance of a special purpose and having been made to serve a single aim. As soon, however, as attention was directed behind the superinduced unity to the detailed law, it came to be recognised that the laws which were there collected were derived from very different sources and belonged to very varied periods in the national life.¹

Much of the legislation is primitive, so far as the condition of the people is concerned. The village sheikhs administer a very primitive law in their little communities, cf., e.g., xxii. 13 f. Blood revenge, which always means a weak central authority, is prevalent; and again it is the village-elders who determine the guilt of the offender (xix. 1 ff.). Indeed, one of the salient features in the entire legislation is the way in which it ignores a centralised tribunal or a central authority, such as came to exist under the kingdom. Some of this legislation is rudimentary, so far as religious ideas are concerned. The rules in connexion with a corpse discovered in the open fields point to early, crude ideas about blood and its dangerous power (xxi. 1 ff.). Legislation, based on such ideas, might easily linger in the country, but here it is embodied in a code which has been accepted by prophets, the priesthood and the court. Different stages of thought are clearly represented. Prophecy in one passage is tested by the simple criterion of whether the predicted event happens as the prophet foretold it (xviii. 21 f.). Again, it is tested by whether the general content of the prophet's message is in agreement with the fundamental principles of the Yahweh religion (xiii. 1-3). Evidently, then, the book had its own history, before it became the official law-book of the nation. One of the rituals prescribed is already so old and primitive as to have passed out of use in the

¹ Cf. such work as that of Puukko.

period of Josiah. No one has ever suggested that the feast of harvest-thanksgiving, which was carried out under Josiah, and which was so prominent a feature of the reform, followed the simple rubric, which is laid down in xxvi. 1-7. Yet it forms part of the law-book which was then made the official code for the national worship.

These are but casual illustrations, which might be largely increased, of how closer examination of the book by the use of historical criticism has brought clearly to light the fact that its legislation represents different conditions of the people, different theological attitudes, a non-homogeneous ritual. And, what is of greatest significance, the conditions of the national life and the ritual represented in the book do not correspond with the features of both, which we know from other sources to have been prevalent in Josiah's time.

So long as these phenomena were sporadically presented, it remained possible to meet the difficulty which each of them successively offered by the statement that Deuteronomy was not a wholly new creation of date 621. The legislators, it was urged, did not set about the preparation of an otherwise unknown body of law; they codified the best legislation which had prevailed in the past. Only it becomes increasingly necessary to press for a definition of what is precisely meant by codification. Personally I am not clear as to its meaning, but presume it implies collecting into a final form the varied laws as to human conduct and the differing rubrics as to divine worship which were previously in existence among the people. These were also submitted to a new spirit and made to serve a common aim, in obedience to which aim the laws which were out of harmony with this were eliminated, while certain features in the accepted laws were modified.

But, if the object of the legislators was so useful and so practical, it becomes difficult to understand why they in-

cluded an archaic rubric about the harvest-thanksgiving which they did not themselves follow. If they wished to set before their people the best guidance possible as to how one could recognise a prophet, it did not clarify matters to the simple-minded to find in the official document that there were two such means. If they were actually using the centralised authority to purify the life of the nation, it is puzzling to find them issuing a code which ignores entirely any central authority, and rather reaffirms the local dignitaries whose power was being superseded.

Above all, why does the command, that only "unto the place which Yahweh your God shall choose out of all your tribes to put His name there" shall the Israelite be permitted to bring his offerings, appear more than once and in varied forms in chapter xii. ? It is said that this implies the restriction of all sacrificial worship to the temple at Jerusalem, and that this was precisely the new element which was introduced into Israel's worship at the time of Josiah. Where then did the different forms come from, which have been collated in the chapter and have not even been combined into one final form of law ? Since they have been codified or collected into an ultimate form, the natural conclusion appears to be that they must have been previously issued at different times and even in different places. Then the dilemma becomes very sharply defined. If these laws were meant to confine the practice of sacrifice to the temple at Jerusalem, they must have been issued somewhere prior to the codification of Deuteronomy, in which case the restriction of worship was not first enacted in the year 621. Or these laws do not confine sacrifice to only one sanctuary, in which case it becomes more easy to understand why the book never mentions Jerusalem.

To follow out this line is tempting, but out of place here. It is enough to say here that the application of the same

historical criticism which produced the regnant hypothesis is forcing students to recognise that the book of Deuteronomy as a whole has a history,¹ and that inside the book the groups of law, even the individual laws, have a history. The application of this fact will have a far-reaching influence on the attitude which must be taken to the reform under Josiah.

Certainly the recognition that much in Deuteronomy is old would help to explain how the law-book came to be enforced at all, if it was made the official legislation in 621. While others have been gravely disturbed by the ethical question as to what must be thought of the morality of the body of men who obtained the imprimatur of their boy king, and claimed the authority of Moses, for a code which they had themselves created, I confess to have been always much exercised over the humbler difficulty as to how a corpus of law, deeply affecting and transforming the life of an entire nation in connexion with its habits of religious worship, was ever passed and enforced *per saltum* at the bidding of a civil authority. Some of you, who are still students, may be able to believe that the habits of a congregation can be changed by a decision passed by a kirk-session. But all here, who have been wholesomely disciplined by practical acquaintance with the actual way in which congregations function, know very well that there is nothing in connexion with which devout people are more conservative and more justly conservative than the minor practices which have formed round their religious worship. Habits, which have become woven into a people's life through the long process of the years and which are very dear through their association with very tender experience, are not abandoned at the

¹ One can only refer to Hempel: *Die Schichten des Deuteronomiums*, one of the most interesting and unpretentious modern books on the subject. It were a benefit to English students, if the book were translated.

bidding of any authority, no matter how well trusted it may be. The one thing which is more sure than that the Jewish people did not abandon their treasured religious habits at the bidding of their young king and his priesthood is that the priests were not so ignorant of the limitations of their authority as ever to attempt so far-reaching a change. Deuteronomy only gathered up into one code and submitted to one aim what had slowly been framing itself in Israel as the true way of worshipping Yahweh and of living under His control. And if the codification took place under Josiah, the reformers were even careful to preserve as legitimate some practices which were already passing away.

The critical theory brought forward and emphasised the change which was made in Israel's life through the adoption of Deuteronomy in the year 621. But the use of the same principles which gave rise to the theory has served to prove how old a great part of the legislation must have been, and how much of what took place under Josiah may have been the selection and arrangement of the best law in the past and its issue under the authority of the national leaders. Now the effects of such a change of attitude are bound to be far reaching, and some remain to be seen. There are at least two which are immediate and deserve mention.

Since a great part of the legislation contained in the book of Deuteronomy existed before it was codified, the period which saw its first introduction must have been instinct with moral effort and religious vitality in every part of the national life. Step by step, in thought about the meaning of its sacrifices and in the method of conducting its feasts, in the purification of the bamoth from heathen emblems, in legislation about the poor and about usury, in action for checking the excesses of blood revenge, the nation must have been struggling up from heathen to higher ideas. The prophets cannot have been isolated voices in old Israel, and

they were never so separate from the actual life of the nation as they have often been represented. This legislation embodies their ideals, and much of it must have been passed while they were actually alive. They must have been the representatives of a movement, which was most clearly enunciated by them, but which was always winning its slow and steady way among the peasants, among the priests, even among the officials. And while the prophets were always in advance of the opinion and practice of their own time, and while, as such, they were always the severest critics of their own time, they embodied and deepened an opinion which was widely extended and quite effective. So to think of the life of old Israel is to have a view which is more genuinely historical, because it has a clearer sense of real development in a people's life and faith than is apt to be suggested by the rigid formulæ of the regnant hypothesis.

The second effect, however, is as important as the other. There is need to define more clearly than has yet been done what was the new element which came into the life of Israel at the time of Josiah. Some novel element entered the cult and the religion of Israel at this period. But, if Deuteronomy is to be construed more and more as the codification of the best material in the old legislation, it is difficult to discover a novel factor there. Nor can it be looked for in the new spirit or the common aim to which the whole codified law was submitted. For that spirit was what produced the individual laws. To group them in its light was only to make more patent what was already there : it was not to superinduce something which did not already exist. The new factor must be in the conclusion which was drawn from, the particular use which was made of, or the special application which was given to, the older body of law. Precisely what this was demands definition.

How then does it fare with the third position, according

to which a definite system of legislation called the Priestly Code was adopted by the post-exilic community at the bidding of its leader Ezra in an hour of religious and political enthusiasm ? The code, then introduced and bound upon the community, marked the entry, or, if not the entry, the dominance of a new legalistic spirit, which in turn produced a literature that recast the history of Israel and revised its institutions. Thus the Priestly Code is far more than a law-book : it contains, e.g., a revision of the early tales in Genesis, and especially of the incidents at Sinai. This position is the Achilles' heel of the theory, and here, more than anywhere else, it has suffered heavily.

The first question which has been raised is the fundamental one of the historicity of the account of Ezra's work. Did the post-exilic community ever gather together and, after hearing read a detailed series of law, solemnly pledge themselves to observe this law as the basis of their new life in Jerusalem ? Is it even conceivable that such a thing was ever done ? Now I have not the time, nor have you the patience, to enter into the perplexing question of the sources and the reliability of our books of Ezra, Nehemiah and Esdras. The discussion of that question has produced a considerable literature, and is still, in many of its features, undetermined. But one thing Torrey ¹ has clearly proved, viz., that all our present accounts of Ezra the priest are derived from the Chronicler. In all the period of the return from exile Ezra is the Chronicler's great hero. In this respect, however, Torrey has only brought out more clearly what was already recognised. Before his work was published, it was well known that Ezra and Nehemiah are the conclusion of the book of Chronicles, were indeed originally

¹ C. C. Torrey : *Composition and Historical Value of Ezra—Nehemiah : Ezra Studies : Apparatus for Textual Criticism of Chronicles, Ezra, Nehemiah.*

an integral part of that book, and have only been separated from it by something like accident. Yet there was no book in the Old Testament which, so far as its trustworthiness as a historical document was concerned, suffered more at the hands of the critical school than the book of Chronicles. Every statement it contained, unless this was supported by other evidence, was regarded as suspect; and, even in connexion with accepted facts, its bias in reporting them was constantly insisted on. Yet, when this book reported a solemn covenant, according to which a body of men, who had their entire physical and social and political life to reconstruct in a new country, bound themselves to observe a code, a large part of which consisted of meticulous details as to the correct method in which the priests were to perform their sacrifices, the statement was accepted without question. It is impossible to deny that here, with less excuse than in the case of the analysis of Genesis, the theory has been built on a basis which had not been tested. The result has been that the further use of the historical principles, which produced the theory, has undermined its foundation. Torrey believes himself justified in pronouncing that Ezra is not a historical person at all, but a creation of the Chronicler's imagination. And while this conclusion may seem, and does seem to many, an extreme case of historical scepticism, the mere fact that it could be soberly advanced by a serious student of history with a reputation to lose has underlined the fact that in this case historical criticism has ignored history.

It may, however, be justly urged that what the Chronicler has done has been to concentrate into one dramatic act and to represent as the work of one man what was the work of a period and due to the activity of several actors. The fact may still remain that the Priestly Code is the creation of the post-exilic community, when it reconstituted itself at

Jerusalem. To ascribe the act to Ezra is merely to recognise that then the leadership did fall to the priesthood, and that the new Code bears their impress in the subjects in which it is chiefly interested, and in the spirit in which it rewrites all the past history of the nation.

But what has happened in connexion with Deuteronomy has also happened in the case of the Priestly Code. The document, thus disengaged, has been studied by itself in the light of the modern historical method : and the more this has been done, the greater are the difficulties which have emerged, if it is to be regarded as uniform in its character and the product of so late a period.

It may help to clearness, if I ask you to regard the Code, first as a history, then as a body of law.

Thus the Priestly Code is said to present a history from the Creation, which regards everything from the point of view of the origin in the world of Israel's peculiar religion, and which construes Israel's peculiar religion principally as a cult and a law. This book once stood by itself, apart from the earlier accounts, J and E, but was finally amalgamated with these to form our present Pentateuch. Yet, as soon as the book is separated from the others and regarded by itself, three questions at least urgently demand explanation and do not receive it.

If the writers meant their new book to be the official, orthodox account of Israel's past and place in the world, why did they combine it with documents which took a different attitude and which their story was presumably meant to replace ? In particular, when they rewrote the story of the flood, if they meant their account to be the official story of that great event, it is difficult to see why the older story was so fully preserved. It was deliberately preserved, for it was not left aside with the new story added to it : the two were interwoven, and in this way the old was

made so integral a part of the new that it could not be superseded and die out. Yet the two accounts are so wholly different in their character that they are the most easily separated of all our duplicate narratives.

Again, if the Priestly Code history was meant to stand alone as a complete record, it should be able to stand alone. No other account in the Pentateuch can be so easily separated from the other narratives with which it has been combined. The analysis of J and E is confessedly difficult and recognised to be uncertain: P can be distinguished with ease. Yet, so soon as this is done and the P account is printed or read by itself, it becomes evident that it will not stand alone. It is a mere skeleton, which tumbles at once into a heap without the flesh and sinews which are only supplied by the other accounts. It becomes incredible that so bald a narrative ever stood alone, or could be expected to convey any meaning without the additional knowledge which the other accounts alone supplied.

Finally, the supposed uniformity of spirit and outlook is simply not true. I have already given, in connexion with the Priestly Code's account of the flood, an illustration of how large was the outlook, how non-legal was the attitude of some of those who wrote these later and additional accounts. Another notable illustration is to be found in the account of Moses' prayer for the people after their sin with the golden calf. There, too, the writer is facing an ultimate theological question;—what is to happen, should the entire covenanted nation fall away from God's covenant of grace? And the writer suggests that beyond the covenant men find the grace of God which produced a covenant. These noble utterances are in themselves sufficient to prove that, however *borné* the spirit which governs other passages, and however limited their spirit, it is foolish to set down the entire Priestly history as a departure from the inspiration

of the prophets and a refusal to recognise the wide mission of Israel.

If any one should wish to know how the legalists of Jewry rewrote the origins of the world and of their nation, and in what spirit they accomplished their task, he may be advised to read the book known as the little Genesis or the Book of Jubilees. There the tone is uniform and uniformly legal. There the book can stand by itself and needs no supplement from the outside. For there the writer incorporates the more primitive stories of Genesis into his own narrative, but carefully selects before he borrows, and as carefully transforms all his borrowed material before he admits it into his own narrative.¹

But the Priestly Code is primarily a body of legislation, rather than a history. As such, it had to be, and was, studied by itself in the light of historical criticism. And the first thing which emerged from such examination was that the book, like Deuteronomy, was not a unity, but was the outcome of a long development. There are elements in it of a singularly, even startlingly, primitive character, such as the ritual of the scape-goat and the offering of the red heifer. Some of these have patently been submitted to a refining process in the light of higher ideas of the divine nature. By this means grosser factors were eliminated, or new meaning was given to old rites, when these were retained. Some of the laws, again, are clearly of later origin than others which lie near them, as e.g. in the matter of the priests' dues or of the payment expected from each Israelite. The code, in fact, as a code, has a history behind it, and a history of some length and of great complexity.

Where, then, did this development take place, and to

¹ It is time that something was done for the study of the Book of Jubilees from this point of view. On the last occasion when I saw the late Dr. Buchanan Gray, he was urging the need for this piece of work.

what period in the community's life must it be referred ? If all the growth of the law, or even much of it, be located at Jerusalem and assigned to the period after the promulgation of the code by Ezra, it becomes extremely difficult to explain how the Samaritans came to accept these later developments. It is well known that the Samaritan Pentateuch is, with a few inconsiderable modifications, identical with the Hebrew, and that the two rituals were governed by the same law. Now it is possible to conceive that the Samaritan community, before the breach between them and Jerusalem became acute, accepted practically the Priestly Code. But, in view of their claim to be an independent and rival centre of the true religion, it is hard to suppose that they submissively followed each successive modification which was adopted at Jerusalem, and even went so far as to incorporate it in precisely the same language in their code. From what we know of the habits of rival and neighbouring religious communities, it was rather to be expected that they should stiffly maintain the old and make it a ground for claiming to be the true representatives of orthodox tradition.

If, on the other hand, the modifications are placed earlier, where does that carry us ? Certainly into the period before the exile. For the code deals largely with the temple *personnel*, the rubrics for correct performance of the sacrifices, the priestly dues, the community's gifts for vows and freewill offerings, tithes and first-fruits, sin and guilt-offerings. It is too in connexion with these matters that the development of thought and practice can most clearly be traced. It is inconceivable that the exiles, who had a whole world of most urgent affairs to consider, who had, in particular, to determine how they were to continue faithful to their religion without temple or sacrifices, amused themselves by thinking out modifications of a ritual which they were not practising, and about which they had no reason to

feel sure that they should ever have the opportunity to practise it. Yet most of the modifications deal with details of ritual practice, which could only be of interest to men who were actually required to carry them into effect.

Much of the code must therefore be carried back into the period before the exile, and again what was done by the post-exilic community was the codification of a practice which had long been in existence. The laws themselves must have existed under the kingdom, but were reduced to order after the return. This time, however, they were not brought into subservience to a common aim, for there is not the same homogeneity in the Priestly Code as in Deuteronomy. Codification, in this case, must mean collection with a minimum, instead of a maximum, of revision. The real revision of the individual laws by way of refinement of grosser elements and supplying new motives, took place before they were codified. There is even less novelty in the code of Ezra than in the code of Josiah.

That a pretty elaborate code for the guidance of both laity and priests was needed in Northern Israel can be gathered from the description Amos gives of the ritual practised in Bethel under Jeroboam II. That something of the same character was equally required in Judah may be concluded from the elaborate rearrangement made by Ahaz in the temple-worship (2 Kings xvi. 12-16). And that one at least of these "uses" of Bethel or Jerusalem was reduced to writing is known through the experiences which befell the colonists whom Sargon settled in Samaria. The men found that wild beasts had greatly increased in the wasted land, and concluded that these lions were sent by the *numen loci* as a proof of his indignation at no longer receiving his fitting worship. When the situation was reported at Nineveh, the king issued orders that one of the captive Israelite priests should be sent back in order to teach the colonists the

משפט יד. In view of the reasons which led to the priest being sent, this משפט can only have been the priestly code for the due observance of the sacrifices, feasts, etc., of the Yahweh worship. Where did the returned priest get his ritual? Evidently he did not create it, since the reason for its being desired and instituted lay in its being the time-honoured practice, the absence of which was believed to have roused the anger of the local deity against the ignorant new-comers. The man renewed at Bethel the "use" which Amos had witnessed at the same sanctuary.¹

How such a code, once it came into existence, was modified through the influence of the higher religion, represented by the prophets, is suggestively illustrated by the work of Gunkel on the Psalms.² On the one side, Gunkel, using the analogy of the Babylonian Psalms, is bringing forward the close connexion which existed between the Psalter and the cult in old Israel. He finds what he calls the "sitz" of certain psalms, the occasion of their origin, the reason for their continuous use, not in historical events, but in the sacrificial ritual, whether that was practised by an individual in connexion with a vow or a sin-offering, or was the act of the whole community in connexion with one of the annual festivals. A psalm might be part of the ritual used on such an occasion, and sung by priests and by worshippers. But, further, Gunkel has pointed out the remarkable similarity

¹ One cannot help asking what became of this משפט. It had survived the exile, and been restored to the same place from which it had been carried away. Has it vanished without a sign? If, as we must now believe, the first efforts at the restoration of the temple at Jerusalem came from the peasants who were left behind in Judah, and whose priests had been carried into exile by Nebuchadrezzar, it is not impossible that they turned for help to the priesthood at Bethel, and that the priestly code of Northern Israel may form a part of our present Pentateuch, after it had been amalgamated with the "use" of Jerusalem which the Babylonian exiles brought up with them. Through receiving such recognition at the temple, it may have formed the bridge by which the completed code found its way to the community at Samaria.

² Cf. his *Ausgewählte Psalmen*, *passim*.

between certain elements in the older hymns and oracles which appear in the prophets. In phraseology and in idea the hymns and the oracles show a remarkable parallelism.

This means, for one thing, that the sacrifices from the earliest times were accompanied by appropriate rubrics, which, in the form of hymns chanted by worshipper and priesthood, indicated the destination of the offering and the purpose for which it was brought by the individual or the community. The tongue-tied peasant of old Israel received into his hands and into his mouth the expression of his confession, his thanksgiving, his humble desire in connexion with the outward acts of his worship. He heard from the priest what the act could effect in absolution or in promise. But, because these rubrics were meant to express the true attitude of a worshipper and the response he might expect from God, because through them an opportunity was given for guiding the thought of the worshipper, they formed the means for introducing to the *opus operatum* of sacrifice the higher conceptions of Yahweh, His will and His true worship, which were permeating into Israel through the teaching of the prophets.

It becomes easier to understand why a peasant woman in Northern Israel was expected to visit a prophet at the local bamah, and on a holy day of the cult (2 Kings iv. 22-23), why Huldah the prophetess was consulted as to what was to be done with a book of the law (2 Kings xxii. 14). Prophet and priest were not out of all relation to each other, for the prophet had a place about the cult. Because he had such a place, and because his influence appears in the rubrics of the cult, the higher thoughts of the most individual voices ever sent to a nation could permeate that institution of old Israel, which, because it was not the specific creation of the higher faith, was most apt to retain the grosser elements of a semi-

paganism. There was never a time in Israel when the prophetic revelation was not playing upon the cult, criticising it, refining it, interpreting it. In many things it failed, but in many others it had a remarkable success. In one sense, it may be said that the cult in old Israel was a continual drag on the prophet's work : in another sense, it may be even said that the cult, as it came to exist in later Israel, was largely the outcome of the prophet's work.

But this implies that the sharp antithesis set up by the regnant hypothesis, "the law did not precede the prophets ; the prophets preceded the law," is ceasing to have very much meaning, so largely must it be modified. The law, as it came to be, and as it exists, may have succeeded the prophets. But the inter-relation between the two has proceeded with far less hard distinction than was once accepted.

I would not, however, have you suppose that in my judgment the whole critical theory is on the point of disappearing from Old Testament study, that, in Dr. Orr's phrase, *nubecula est quae cito evanescet*. To say this, e.g., as to the analysis of the Genesis stories, would be to determine beforehand the result of that examination of the M T, which is a pressing necessity, but which will be worthless, unless it is unprejudiced. What seems sure is that the hypothesis can only be accepted with grave and fundamental modifications. And I would specially urge all students who come to work here not to begin their Old Testament study with the idea that all these questions are settled beyond the reach of debate. Where the theory has erred has been in the failure fully to apply its own principles. Itself the outcome of historical study and the result of the application of the historical method to the field of Old Testament religion, it has not been fully alive to historical conditions and has ignored many factors. It has, accord-

ingly, framed a rigid, inelastic theory which it has imposed on the movement of history.

In particular, it has utterly failed to recognise that in religious matters humanity does not advance like a drilled army along a well-defined highroad. It has not shown itself conscious of how, inside the same community, there are always great varieties of outlook and great diversity as to method. The same religious communion can harbour at the same period crass observances and sublime vision, legalism in form and mysticism in spirit. And the more vital the religion within the communion is, the more sure is the diversity. Hence the framers of the theory were able to believe in the possibility of changing the entire outlook of a generation and the direction of its religious hopes by a sudden order from Josiah the king, or Ezra the priest, or some other authority. They have failed to recognise that every such larger change can only be enduring when it is itself the product of many previous advances and relapses, efforts and failures.

But in its broad features and, especially, in its guiding principles the critical theory is there for good or ill, or rather for good and ill. For it is based on the historical method. And, while the historical method, misapplied or falsely understood, may lead the student far astray at times, it is finally with us in all dealing with such religious documents as are presented in the Old Testament revelation. All such documents are the outcome of the religious life of a particular period, and can only be rightly understood when they are interpreted in the light of that stage in human and religious thought of which they are the outcome. They cannot be lifted out of all relation to the community in which, and for which, they were framed.

This method of study we do not owe to the critical theory. The theory was a brilliant effort to apply the method. And

if it must be largely modified and largely rejected, it can only be so in submission to the method which brought it into being at first. There can be no return to the old attitude.

ADAM C. WELCH.

THE TEACHING OF JOHN MACLEOD CAMPBELL.

SIR WILLIAM ROBERTSON NICOLL has told us that the late Principal Denney regarded *The Nature of the Atonement* as the only theological classic which Scotland had produced : and this perfectly just judgment implies nothing which Scotsmen need resent : for Christendom in its entirety possesses only a few books that can properly be described as classics of religious doctrine. Campbell's masterpiece has now remained for more than sixty years the greatest of all treatises on the august theme with which it is concerned. It has, indeed, furnished the spiritual and intellectual capital on the interest of which several theologians have supported themselves, and their reputation. Nor is it likely to lose its pre-eminence until there arises one possessed of Campbell's genius ; ready as he was to venture all for an idea ; able also, like him, to endure in gentleness a long and fiery trial, and to devote the central energies of the mind for five-and-twenty years to patient, brooding meditation on one engrossing thought.

It is with intention that one refers thus to the personal qualities and career of the great Scottish " heretic." For it is not possible for anyone to understand or appreciate his teaching who is ignorant of the man and of the circumstances under which his doctrine was developed and his work was done. There have been thinkers of whom it may be said that a knowledge of their career and character does not in the least illuminate their writings. But Campbell is him-

self the key to his doctrine ; his book is what it is because he was what he was. It is true he expressed once the desire that he might be to his readers " a voice and nothing more " ; but *The Nature of the Atonement* is not a voice and nothing more ; it is the whole heart and mind and spirit that were Campbell. It is necessary, therefore, that the student of this man's thought should begin his investigations by securing an adequate knowledge of his strange eventful history : his early pastorate, his trial and deposition for heresy ; his later isolated ministry in Glasgow ; the sweetness and beauty of his character as it developed in adversity : his final attainment and victory.

Campbell appears to us, in the beginning of his way, as a young spiritual cavalier, afire with the zeal of salvation ; impetuous, generous, wilful ; incapable of compromise ; conscious of truths he cannot formulate, aware of a message he cannot fully utter. After this, he enters on a long period of rejection, disappointment, loneliness and ceaseless toil ; but, faithful always to the splendid vision, he treads the path of his appointed pilgrimage, and in constant meditation, service and prayer, comes at last to the hour when he is able to produce the imperishable book that " holds like rich garner the full-ripened grain." Thereafter comes the slowly-dawning time of recognition, honour and peace, through which he passes, in ever deepening wealth of spirit, to his rest in God. Such was the character, and such the experience, which produced *The Nature of the Atonement* ; and those who desire to understand the book must study the man and his life. Whosoever would really know the doctrine of Campbell must make himself one by sympathy with the travail and triumph of which it is the fruit.¹

And yet, while this is true, it is by no means the case

¹ It may be permitted to refer to my articles on *John MacLeod Campbell: the development of his Thought*, in *EXPOSITOR*, January and February, 1921.

that Campbell's doctrinal construction is of subordinate importance, as compared with the religious suggestion and spiritual impulse he imparts. After all, his purpose in writing was dogmatic. Taking for granted the fact of an Atonement, he sought to show that certain ideas as to its nature ought to be rejected and that certain other ideas ought to be received. To persuade men of the truth of his contentions was his primary task, performed with eager, stern intensity. So unrelenting was his pursuit of this appointed end that, on one occasion, he declined a public tribute of respect, on the ground that it did not imply any recognition of the truth for which he stood. Hence, we pay him an honour that would have been little to his mind when we praise his speech and spirit but depreciate his message. Nor are they without justification who are, not merely admirers, but also disciples of Campbell, affirming that his theory of the Atonement is the most profound and adequate yet given to the world.

The main elements in this theory are well enough known ; and they may be stated here in a few lines. Christ as the eternal Son of God incarnate in the flesh has made Atonement for all human sin by offering to the Father a complete satisfaction, meeting the requirements of His perfect justice and love. These requirements of God are confession, penitence, repentance, and obedience adequate to the measure and guilt of sin. But man, because of his own sinfulness, is unable to meet these demands of eternal Righteousness and Fatherhood. The Saviour, however, in virtue of His perfect holiness and His Divine Sonship, is able to do what His erring brothers cannot do. In their room and on their behalf He has presented to God a complete and stainless offering, a repentance, penitence, confession commensurate with the whole sin of the whole world. That which separated the human race from its Creator and Father is thus

removed, and the way is open to final and universal peace.

I.

In proceeding, now, to a closer consideration of Campbell's teaching, we may note, to begin with, two charges of a general kind that are brought against his work. The first is that he is guilty of inaccuracy and mental slackness in his use of words. It is urged, especially, that he misconceives the meaning of "repentance," "penitence," "confession," when he says that the things denoted by these terms were offered by Christ as a sacrifice on our behalf to God; inasmuch as to confess sin and repent are strictly personal acts which no one can accomplish for another. This is a criticism the full answer to which can appear only when we come to consider the speculative side of Campbell's system; but it may be noted here that no one can expect to receive benefit from this writer who demands of him exactness in definition and statement. If we are to go any way with him at all, towards the understanding of his system, we must deny ourselves the pleasure of quarrelling with words, and must interpret his phraseology in a broad and sympathetic way. Campbell had much trouble in the matter of expression at the time of his heresy trial, and he continued to have it till the end. It is, moreover, to be remembered always that he was a pioneer in his own peculiar field of thought, and was subject to the verbal disabilities of the pioneer. His originality can hardly, indeed, be overestimated. It cannot be said that, as regards at least the essentials of his teaching, he owed any considerable debt to other writers, even to Maurice or to Erskine. He admired both of these with sincere and generous enthusiasm, and no doubt was helped in many ways by his communion with them, but it is not apparent that he was greatly influenced by either of them in his own constructive work. The idea,

also, that Jonathan Edwards was a source of inspiration to him, is without much support. He does, indeed, refer to a saying of the American theologian in a way which may seem to indicate that to him he was indebted for the germ of his own theory.¹ That this, however, was not really so becomes clear when we recall that he had practically completed and formulated his doctrine, and was on the eve of actually writing his book, before he set himself to study the Calvinistic divines. Campbell was by nature a teacher rather than a disciple; it was his to give rather than to receive, to guide rather than to be led, to impress other minds more than to accept impressions from them. Thus, his thoughts about the Atonement are exceedingly independent: and when he set himself to write them down there was no vocabulary ready to his hand, prepared and fitted for their perfect utterance. He had to employ the forms of speech that were available to him, and he chose from among these such as were most adequate to his meaning. He was entirely conscious that he was open to misconception when he spoke of Christ as "confessing" and "repenting" on our behalf, but he held that, broadly regarded, these expressions did convey the essential truth. And this essential truth was, as we shall see, that in Christ humanity turned its back upon evil, and set its face with a perfect heart towards the Father's House.

Another defect that is said to lessen the value of Campbell's theological work is its lack of speculative grasp and of philosophical foundation. His theory is held to be a purely religious one, derived from pious experience and moral intuition; expressed in elusive symbols; devoid of metaphysic, and vague in exegesis. He is described as one who is able to draw living water for us from the wells of devotion and poetic vision, but who fails to satisfy the understanding

¹ *Nature of the Atonement*, p. 118.

or, indeed, to address the reason. This is a description which is really incredible, since we may reckon securely that piety without brains never yet produced a theological classic; nevertheless, it represents a view natural enough in those who have no intimate knowledge of the man, and an insufficient acquaintance with his book. Undoubtedly, the really great strength of Campbell's intellect is obscured somewhat by the passionate devoutness of his life and teaching. When he was dying he said: "I can think of nothing but God and Christ"; and this last confession was the sincere utterance of his personality. It is true, also, that he himself ascribed the beginning of his development to the constraint, not of reflection, but of practical observation. Moreover, it appears that those who made his acquaintance during his ministry were impressed, at first, chiefly by the simple nobility and sweetness of his character and the unaffected devotion of his soul. They thought of him rather as a wonderful type of Christian manhood than as a strong and dominant mind; and it was only when they came to know him in intimate discussion and debate that they realised, with a kind of surprise, that they were in contact with a spirit of astounding subtlety, force and daring.

Nor is it otherwise in the case of those who, not having understood the man, enter upon the study of his book. He employs the vocabulary, not of philosophy, but of religion; he is content to speak of spiritual things in the terms of ordinary belief; the awe of Christian conviction pervades his every utterance; and he approaches every point in his discussion in the attitude of living and ardent faith. Hence the metaphysical element in his doctrine is apt to be overlooked. Yet Campbell was by no means a pietist or the exponent of a mere theology of experience. He had a quite frank and uncompromising confidence in the rationality of faith, and in the necessity of thinking out its problems in

strict fidelity to knowledge. Thus, he says: "He who deprives me of Revelation may still leave me Reason; but he who takes Reason from me, in doing so takes away Revelation also."¹ His letters show, further, that he never entertained the idea of accepting a doctrine with the "feeling" and rejecting it with the understanding; and he was a stranger to the modern art of believing a thing while at the same time denying it. His criticism of Calvinism, for instance, is almost wholly intellectual; and he set aside Unitarianism, after careful thought, on grounds that were mainly philosophic. He complains that Evangelicalism is, in many of its tenets, not only inconsistent with Scripture, but "repugnant to reason"; and it is evident that his revolt against the orthodox doctrine of Atonement was largely rational, and was associated with the type of philosophy indicated by his testimony that he listened to Edward Caird's inaugural address "with almost complete assent." But, indeed, the speculative bent of Campbell's mind requires no demonstration to any really careful student of his book. To such an one it gradually becomes apparent that the entire theory there stated might be expressed, as to its essentials, in terms of transcendental metaphysic. In short, those who patiently seek a true understanding of Campbell's doctrine, like those who knew him in the flesh, will come to discern that, beneath all the religious wealth and beauty, and all the symbolic language, of this writer, there lies an intellect of startling grip, penetration, insight, and audacious adventure.

II.

This speculative and metaphysical aspect of Campbell's thought becomes, indeed, clear to us as soon as we ask ourselves what the main convictions are which inform his theory of Atonement, and determine its construction. In

¹ *Reminiscences*, p. 105.

answer to this question we find that these essential constraining forces are two. The first of these is a profound realisation of the guilt and burden of sin ; and the second is an equally deep assurance that there is a core of goodness in human nature which renders possible the hope of a perfect salvation. The former of these is of course chiefly, though not entirely, moral and religious in its origin ; but the latter is predominantly theoretic and rational.

(a) The energy with which Campbell asserts the reality and terror of sin is a thing which requires no proof or illustration. In the sermons preached during his early ministry at Row this element in the Christian message was uttered with a passionate fervour which seemed to destroy sometimes the continuity of his speech, even as too great a volume of the electric stream will fuse the wire that carries it. His sentences became broken, confused, incoherent, in the intensity of his desire to convey to his hearers a sense of the tragedy and peril of human transgression. In later life this side of his testimony was expressed with increasing sanity and tenderness and pity, as the sympathy and cheerful kindness of his character developed, and as he learned to appreciate the pathos and the difficulty of the human lot. But it retained till the last its accent of dominant conviction ; it is evident on every page of his book ; and it explains the earnestness of his belief in the necessity of the expiation that was wrought by Christ.

(b) The second of the two fundamental convictions which underlie Campbell's theory is not so apparent as the first, and may well be missed by a careless reader of his writings ; for he has a singular habit of stating things that are essential to his message in an almost casual manner, and without calling attention to their importance. Yet, a belief in undying possibilities of the highest good, as inherent in humanity, is as necessary to his doctrine as is a perception

of the guilt of sin. Thus, he says of Christ : " His own consciousness in humanity witnessed within Him that humanity was capable of being filled with the life of love." " The more perfectly He realised that these were His brethren whose hatred was coming forth against Him, the more did He realise also that hatred was not of the essence of their being." ¹ Elsewhere he speaks of " an inestimable preciousness that was hidden in our humanity, hidden from its inheritors themselves, but not hid from God and now brought into manifestation by the Son of God." And at this point there comes into view his mystical conception of the eternal union between the Son of God and every man. " The capacity for righteousness that was in humanity " was in it " only relatively, that is as dwelt in by the Son of God." ² Here we have the doctrine of an ideal manhood which exists in all men. And this ideal manhood, if it be from one point of view only a promise and potency, is yet, otherwise regarded, a true existence, since it is identical with the everlasting Son of God, by whose incarnation and life in the flesh it comes to perfect fruition as a thing actual and accomplished. Further, there is a relation between the Son of God and the sons of men, not of the flesh only but also of the spirit : and the Son of God has " power over all flesh to impart eternal life." ³ That is to say, the perfect manhood realised in Jesus is able, by the help of His divine grace, to quicken the kindred germ of ideal life which is in each of us ; and it does this as soon as we believe in it and make ourselves one with it by love and faith. This is the optimism of MacLeod Campbell, and from this source he derived a hope for the whole race, profound, unmeasured, but dependent, for its existence, on the eternal Sonship hidden in God and, for its realisation, on the Saviour and His perfect work.

¹ *Nature of the Atonement*, p. 140. ² *Ibid.*, p. 138. ³ *Ibid.*, p. 138,

III.

These, then, are the two great assertions which are at the root of the system which *The Nature of the Atonement* elaborates; the guilt of human transgression, and the core of good that remains in every soul. There is of course no opposition between them; rather does the one imply the other. For it is in proportion as we recognise the possibilities that are hidden within us that we are enabled to estimate duly the character of that evil thing which thwarts these possibilities and robs them of their fulfilment in the life of God. Certainly, it was the combination of these convictions that inspired the work of Campbell; for without the first he would not have felt the necessity of atonement, and without the second he would not have been able to believe atonement possible. But it is in the optimistic aspect of his thought that we find the speculative element which is of most importance for theologians. One would not, indeed, affirm that even his belief in the indwelling Sonship of God, as the possession of every man, was entirely the fruit of philosophy. For he had learned in his experience as a pastor, as an observer of life in many lands, and as a student of great literature, not only to perceive the corruption of human nature, but to discern its hidden divine possibilities. He tells us, for instance, in one of his letters that, spite of his love of natural beauty, and especially of the romantic scenes of his native Highlands, he had yet felt that God was even nearer to him in the great city than in quiet country places; since it was in the lives of men, more than in Nature, that the Father revealed Himself. Nevertheless, his optimism was mainly inspired by a mystical Idealism reacting on his knowledge of Jesus Christ.

The form under which Campbell apprehends the truth of the Incarnation, and the speculative basis of his theory of Atonement, is essentially the doctrine of the Logos, as

elaborated by Philo, adapted to Christian ends by the Evangelist John, and repeated, with various modifications, by that long line of mystical thinkers to whom Christian theology is so great a debtor. St. John was, of all the New Testament writers, the one that Campbell loved the best. The Fourth Gospel had, for him, apostolic authority ; but he was not much concerned about Biblical criticism, and justly claims that his own conclusions are independent of its results. The reason why the Johannine writings had a special appeal for him was that they were congenial to his mind, and embodied a combination of religious insight and devoutness with a type of philosophy which was akin to his own. Of course, Campbell nowhere professes himself to be of this or that opinion in philosophy, any more than did St. John ; and persons of differing metaphysical views may agree in accepting his theology, just as they may unite in love of the Fourth Gospel. Nevertheless, he was quite clearly an Idealist in matters of pure thought ; his speech betrays him. It was Idealism that caused the orthodox Lutheran, Dorner, to affirm : " The soul remains metaphysically good." It was Idealism that inspired the Roman Catholic apologist, Moehler, to say : " The Church must live according to an idea to which the vulgar reality can never be equal : how else should it be vulgar ? " And it also enabled the same writer to combine with a frank confession of the infamies of ecclesiastical history the triumphant assertion : " But the Church hath never erred, hath never fallen, hath never gone astray." And, in like manner, it was Idealism that enabled Campbell to affirm the uttermost horror of sin and yet to own that the divine Sonship hidden from eternity with Christ in God had an indwelling counterpart in every soul of man.

It is necessary to emphasise this aspect of matters, for the neglect of it has been the basis of some misunderstanding

criticism. Many writers, as we have seen, contend that repentance and confession are personal acts which cannot be vicariously accomplished, and that therefore there is unreality in Campbell's conception of Jesus as fulfilling them, in our stead, and offering this fulfilment as a sacrifice on our behalf to God. This objection, in so far as it rests on merely verbal grounds, is, as already suggested, of small importance ; but in its substance it strikes at the heart of the whole theory under consideration. If we agree with Campbell that the notion of vicarious punishment is not acceptable, if we concede also his doctrine that adequate repentance is the only sufficient expiation for sin, and if we grant also that his critics are right in maintaining that such an expiation cannot be vicariously accomplished, then nothing remains to us but a purely revelational and moral-influence view of the Atonement, which is not adequate to New Testament teaching, or to the demands of the Christian mind as it has existed throughout the ages of the Church's life. But, in point of fact, the criticism in question has force for us only so long as we ignore or set aside Campbell's speculative position. In his view, Christ was not merely the representative Man, not simply one supreme individual standing at the head of a host of other individuals ; He was the essential humanity which is metaphysically present in every one of His brethren. He was that essential humanity incarnate and perfectly realised. It was, therefore, strictly true to say that in the repentance and confession of Christ mankind itself repented and confessed. The voice of Jesus ; the sorrow of Jesus ; the assent of Jesus to the Divine hatred of sin, and His utter and unconditional rejection of it as an element in man's true life : these were all the acts of humanity, come to itself and doing what it must necessarily do as soon as its true indwelling nature becomes self-conscious and is brought to its fulfilment. The Priesthood

of the Saviour was the Priesthood not of another than man, or of one man, but of the very soul of the race, with its inmost life consummated through its union in the flesh with the everlasting Son.

It may, indeed, be held that Jesus could not have any true sense of sin or penitence, inasmuch as He had no experience of moral evil as an element in His own life ; so that He was debarred from the offering of a real sacrifice for men by the very fact of His own unspotted purity. But it is evident that if this criticism were valid it would follow that God Himself, in virtue of His holiness, would be unable to understand the evil of the human heart, or to perceive the burden of it, or to judge it in truth and righteousness. Moreover, this same objection is contrary to all experience, which attests that it is only as the latent goodness in any soul is roused and vitalised that it feels the sense of guilt, and that this sense increases in depth and pathos with every increase of moral insight and every advance in the wisdom that is born of self-surrender. It is to be observed, also, that those who find the conception of a perfect repentance on the part of Christ incredible accept, as a rule, the fact of His complete obedience to God : and it does seem that, in doing this, they admit the substance of Campbell's view, since an unbroken obedience is really a concrete, sustained, and absolute repentance. Of course, there are things in our common penitence that could not be in the consciousness of Jesus ; but these are not of the essence of the matter, and they were replaced, in the mind of the Saviour, by things that are their better part. Jesus could not feel Himself to be a sinner, but He could feel sinners to be Himself.

One great difficulty does, however, really beset the theory of Campbell. He maintains that God requires of men a perfect repentance and confession of sin, and at the same time he admits that this requirement men cannot possibly

fulfil. And the question arises whether the righteous Father may justly ask of His children that which they cannot give. Our vision is obscured by the results of an evil inheritance ; our memories are so dulled by habit that we cannot even call to mind the wrong that we have done ; the voice of conscience within us is so enfeebled that it is unable to declare to us the measure of our own transgression ; and the moral judgment is so perverted that it is incapable of rightly estimating the extent of our guilt. Even our best repentance, even our most passionate and sincere confession, must therefore fail always of so much as an approach to perfectness. Why then, should this perfectness be required of us ? Why should God not accept as sufficient that which it is possible for us to give ? Why should it not be enough that we should sincerely offer the only reparation within our reach, even though it be marred by our infirmity, even though it be presented "not as we ought but as we are able ?" ¹

This is a real perplexity, and to many it seems to present an insuperable objection to the whole idea of Atonement, as stated by Campbell. A little thought, however, shows us that the doctrine we thus impugn has a basis that lies deeper than the ground of our complaint. If God be indeed our Father, as Jesus has taught us to believe, and if we are His sons in a sense of corresponding reality, then the tragedy of our position lies in our estrangement from Him in whom is our true life. It is this estrangement that must be done away if there is to be any reconciliation. So long as this alienation remains there cannot be a real home for us in the Father's House. No external act of amnesty or oblivion, no mere Divine indulgence, no expiation by pain and travail,

¹ Cf. J. Dick Fleming, D.D. : *Redemption*, pp. 164-165. It is surprising to find this learned and sympathetic writer pronouncing Campbell's theory to be "grotesquely out of harmony" with the facts.

can alter the inexorable truth of things. And the truth of things is this, that in so far as sin remains unrepented with a repentance adequate to its guilt, there must abide a shadow between the soul and God, a Divine antagonism to something that is in us and a human lack of sympathy with something that is in God. Confession that is not adequate to the thing to be confessed cannot avail to make an end of that which lies between us and the Father. If we were less than sons of God, it might be otherwise ; if He were less than our Father, it might be otherwise. But since our relationship to the Most High is what it is, nothing less than an act which completely destroys sin can restore to us the blessedness that is our chiefest good or give to God that unclouded communion with His children in which alone He can be satisfied.

These, then, are some of the thoughts that occur to us as we consider *The Nature of the Atonement* in the light of its author's mind and life ; these are some of the answers that may be given to the strictures of those who reject its teaching, on that side of it which concerns the dealings of Christ on our behalf with God. No doubt, there are states of mind in which the whole construction we have been discussing seems to us unreal, because its assertion that there exists in all of us an ideal manhood, an indwelling Sonship, appears to be at discord with the sordid facts of life. But it is well that we should consider what this mood of ours involves, and whither it leads us. It is equal to the denial of the whole spiritual view of the world which is the foundation of the Christian faith. If there be not something within us that is the veritable child of God, then there can be no question of Immortality or Incarnation or Atonement, since there remains in us nothing that can survive the body, or afford a dwelling-place for God, or be capable

of reconciliation with the Father. The affirmation of a natural Sonship to the Divine, hidden in each man, is thus not a bare metaphysical abstraction, but the vital basis of all religion.

But, if such a natural Sonship be a reality, it must, as Campbell teaches, constitute the organic unity of all souls as well as be the individual possession of each. Also, as being the ideal humanity, it must remain, at least in germ and possibility, at one with God; for otherwise it would not be ideal. That is to say, it corresponds to the typical humanity hidden in the secret place of the Divine thought. But, if this be so, there is nothing artificial in the doctrine that this ideal manhood uttered itself completely in the Incarnate Son. It is evident also that such utterance could take no other form than that of perfect obedience, penitential rejection of all sin, filial assent to the judgment of God, and a life of unbroken communion with Him. These things are the necessary expression of the true manhood attaining to complete inheritance of its own nature. And they do constitute an accomplished Atonement; a reconciliation actual and everlasting, which awaits only the Amen of all individual souls in order to achieve an Universe according to the mind of God.

In this essential teaching, the doctrine of Campbell stands secure: it corresponds to the demands of conscience and to the requirements of spiritual reflection; it gives us the assurance of something decisively effected for our deliverance by One who is another, and yet who is ourselves; something that is the solitary attainment of the Saviour, but also, by His grace, the potential possession of us all. It holds up for us an everlasting light above the ebb and flow of circumstance, and it affords us an incorruptible hope amid the passion and the perplexity and the disillusion of the world. And it is for this reason that those who have felt the power

of Campbell's message, and have found in it relief from many haunting doubts, hold him in singular honour and gratitude. We do indeed owe a debt of thankfulness to this man who sowed in trouble a harvest of peace for our reaping ; who built for us a structure of faith on the ruins of his earthly hopes, and attained through temporal failure an achievement that is immortal.

J. H. LECKIE.

JESUS THE LAW BREAKER.

Matthew relates words of Jesus.

"THE bridegroom's friends will never fast
Till the festive rites are past ;
Soon enough will come the day
To fast . . . when he is gone away. . . .
Taken from them. . . .

But you—no wonder
That your minds are torn in sunder :
The fragile robes of faith outworn,
Patched with new cloth, the worse are torn ;
Ancient wine-skins burst and spill
The fresh wine : it is best to fill
New skins with new wine. Yet, indeed,
It's no child's play to change your creed :
Lips that have tasted mellow wine
Never call the new-drawn fine.
And if your fasting can reveal
A Realm these veils of flesh conceal,
Then fast. For full in sight of men
I stand, and yet I am not seen ;
Therefore my soul is grieving over
The sons of men, since I discover
All drunken, yet no one I find
Athirst, all having eyes, yet blind."

So they who thought to ensnare Him swept away
Like carrion birds deprived of hoped-for prey.
On us He faintly smiled : "To you I say,

When you would fast don't pull long faces,
And stand about in public places.
Hypocrites do so that they
May win men's praise ; they have their pay.

No, when you fast, let outward mien
Shine with the self-bestowing sheen,
Of heavenly joy ; anoint your head
And wash your body ; then, instead
Of man to marvel or approve,
Behold unveiled your Father's love !

Take heed, also, lest men should see
You practising your charity.
Do not be like the hypocrites
Who flourish trumpets in the streets
When they give their alms, that they
May win men's praise : they have their pay.
No ! Do not let your right hand guess
What your left does ; and then, in place
Of man to marvel or approve,
Behold unveiled your Father's love !

And when you pray, don't imitate
The hypocrites who stand in state
Praying in church or street, that they
May win men's praise ; they have their pay.
Nay ! Go into your room before
You start to pray and shut the door.
For with God's eyes you have to do :
He sees in secret, judges true.
Man will not see you nor approve,
But there God will unveil His love.

And if sometimes, when silently
You kneel alone, you think that He
Does not hear, or does not care,
Do not lose heart : He still is there.
Do not think the God behind
The illusive curtain of your mind
Is all you have for Father. . . . Yet
Since you believe He might forget
His children, you will have to pray
Till that curtain fades away.
For even as Pity broods behind
The fiercest mask of humankind,
Behind your dreams of God most dread
A Father yearns, with hands outspread.

I think I never will forget
A fierce old judge in Nazaret ;
I used to watch him walk abroad
Railing against man and God.

A widow I knew well in town
 Again and yet again came down
 To his court-room, and cried, "Prithee
 Avenge me of mine enemy."
 For a while he would not stir;
 Then said, "Tho' I do not fear her,
 Nor man, nor God, I'll see her through,
 Or else she'll beat me black and blue."
 His speech was ruder than his heart:
 He heard her cry and took her part.
 Yes,—men are better than they seem,
 And God far kinder than you deem.

Here Jesus' eyes fell on the Pharisees,
 Gentle with hopes that whispered: "Even these,
 Were they but tended, might be goodly trees!"

Alas, blind exiles from a happier place
 Than that you close against the Master's face,
 Think you *Him* outcast; *you*, the sons of grace?

Well, call Him outcast: always He goes drest
 In humble garb, and takes us lowliest
 And lost for His companions. You have guessed

No depths so deep as those He trod, before
 I found Him standing knocking at my door:
 Only great love may such great deeps explore!

* * * * *

Three days after my feast, on Sabbath morn
 Jesus was walking through the fields of corn
 That sweep the base of Hattin's Western Horn.

And His disciples plucked the ears, and ate.
 "Look!" cried some Pharisees whom we had met,
 "This is the Sabbath: how dare they forget!"

But Jesus turned to them, and said,
 "In the Bible you have read
 How David and his men one day,
 Being hungry, took away
 The bread from off the altar, though
 The Law bids none but priests do so;
 And here beneath the dome of heaven
 My friends, like David's, are forgiven.
 Does not the Temple Law explain
 How priests the Sabbath may profane?
 And if this be the Sabbath, well,

Even here within His Courts we dwell :
For never temple did exist
Empty of worshipper and priest,
And never priest or worshipper
In spirit and in truth did fare
Down Mercy's sacred road,
His feet outside the House of God.
And while in these fair fields of corn
My disciples, hunger-torn,
Eat and worship, God is there;
And this becomes the House of Prayer,
And those His priests, and this His bread,
With Mercy, not with Judgment, spread.
O, there is something more for fear
And trembling, than the Temple here !
But Mercy's ways are past your ken
Therefore you blame guiltless men :
God made the Sabbath, by your showing,
Then made man to keep it going ;
Whom God made lord you make the slave
Of the free gift his Father gave,—
Gave to His own child, to trace
By its sweet use a Father's face.
See yonder reaper in the glade,
Pausing now to whet his blade,
If he with heart and mind at rest
Says 'Here and now I serve God best,'
He keeps the Sabbath ; but is he free
Of such heart-singleness, then he
Is cursèd,—breaking God's decree."

Jesus Himself goes every Sabbath day
Joyfully to God's house to sing and pray ;
Grief, when she looks on Him, dissolves away.

I never knew that Sabbath eves were sweet,
Until I spent them at the Master's feet,
Hearing Him softly to His friends repeat
Psalm after psalm, and deep into the night
Talk with us there, as you would think God might,
Should He descend from His eternal height,
Should He come down to dwell as man with men . . .
Ah, when those evenings come I drop my pen :
I can but sit listening, listening then.

EDITH ANNE ROBERTSON
JAMES ALEX. ROBERTSON.

SOME UNLIT LAMPS.

EVEN the most scholarly and suggestive volumes on the teaching of our Lord admit the obscurity of certain of His illustrations. In the parable of the selfish judge, for instance, it is strange to find that selfish figure just where we expected to find one who illustrates, however slightly, the ways and thoughts of God. The praising of the dishonest steward presents more difficulty than many commentators seem to assume. Of the parable of the Labourers, Dr. James Drummond writes : “ It is not at all obvious how it teaches the lesson which it is expressly intended to set forth.” Similar remarks are frequently written concerning other of the parables ; yet “ an illustration that requires explanation is worthless ! ”

In a sense, of course, even the most obvious parables require explanation. Jesus was questioned as to the meaning of the story of the Sower. But, as Dr. Burkitt says in *The Gospel History and its Transmission*, “ I think that what the hearers found most strange and difficult was not the parabolic form in which Jesus was speaking to them. The difficulty lay in the doctrine itself, the doctrine of the growth of the Kingdom of God.” The purpose of this paper is to suggest that for the men and women to whom Jesus spoke, there were no parables whose form presented any difficulty ; if we find them difficult to-day, the difficulty is due not to obscurity of thought or expression, but to an allusion—probably a simple one—that we have missed.

This is a very safe assumption. We have some right to assume that our Lord was luminously clear in His teaching ; that His “ dexterity to fill narrow vessels with a funnel ” was as pronounced as was that of Plato’s Socrates. And how smoothly does Socrates lead his hearers onward step by

step ! How easily do his readers, still, follow the course of his discussions. Yet, even amid the profound simplicities of Socrates, we come occasionally upon an allusion that would be lost on any reader who is merely modern. In Book I of the *Republic*, for instance, we find such a little picture as this : " When I heard this speech (of Thrasymachus) I was astounded, and gazed at the speaker in terror ; and I think if I had not set eyes upon him before he eyed me I should have been struck dumb." More than one reader here must have been grateful for the editorial note that " Socrates alludes to a popular belief that anyone meeting a wolf would be deprived of speech if the wolf happened to see him before he saw the wolf." Just because the allusion was so delightfully natural and pointed the modern reader is apt to overlook it ; but acquaintance with that fragment of past superstition at once kindles the lamp of the little parable ; and we are able to appreciate the humour which represents Thrasymachus, wild-eyed and wolf-like, leaping into the debate eager for blood, and likely to shed his own. Similarly in looking at certain of our Lord's parables we have the feeling that the thought is clear, but a simple allusion has been missed ; the lamp is there, complete and beautiful, but in almost total darkness. Commentators have often shown skill in burnishing the lampstand till it yields a pleasant glow. But we need sometimes a little something—a match of some kind—that, instead of burnishing the stand, will kindle the wick and give light to all that are in the house.

Is the match to be found ? We make a beginning if we accept the principle that the teaching of our Lord was indirect autobiography. It will be remembered that Professor Du Bose laid stress on this in *The Gospel in the Gospels*. " The beatitudes," he wrote, " are the revelation of His own humanly discovered and humanly expe-

rienced secret of blessedness." For the present writer, that idea, when first read, came as a Revelation. It made all the difference between burnishing lamps in the New Testament and lighting them.

But it may be possible to push this principle further. It is possible that not only did our Lord speak out of His own experience of the things of which He spoke, but that *all* His illustrations were chosen from the things that were perfectly familiar to His hearers. It is unlikely that His illustrations were manufactured. The preacher of to-day gladly calls to his assistance Mr. Micawber and the Red Queen and Dr. Jekyll and the Forsytes, and a hundred others. He uses these figures because in a sense they are alive. They are assumed to be familiar to his hearers; with their help a sentence summarises a whole paragraph or even chapter; and a wise touch, introducing an element of surprise, graves the lesson indelibly.

Certain of the parables can yield little meaning unless we are prepared to assume that their central figures were as familiar to the first hearers as, for instance, Mr. Micawber is to us. "Jesus sat over against the treasury and beheld how the multitude cast money into the treasury. . . . And there came a certain poor widow, and she cast in two mites which make a farthing. And He called unto Him His disciples and said unto them. . . ." In such a way as that did the parables originate. Not only from Nature, but from His brethren, did our Lord take His illustrations. His very delight in them opened His eyes to the light and shade in their character. "A state of keen enjoyment is a state of high mental activity. Delight develops attention, and attention develops more delight. That same object which under a cold gaze reveals no interest may, under an eye already kindled with pleasure, develop unlimited value." The men and women of the parables were precious to Jesus

if only by reason of their oddities ; and they were notabilities, even if their reputation was purely local. The parable of the Pounds encourages this conviction ; it appears artificial until we read that it “ rests on a historical incident and that the view of most interpreters is that it is the journey of Archelaus to Rome to secure His kingdom, and the embassy of the Jews to thwart him, to which Jesus here alludes.” Setting to work under the guidance of this idea, we find it a simple matter to distinguish the picture from the frame, and to find in the picture what the artist intended. May not the same be true of other parables, such as the Labourers, the Unjust Steward, the Man without the Wedding Garment, the Friend at Midnight ? In these stories we have history ; references to the celebrities of a small country town ; allusions to village incidents—things that had recently happened, bringing to the villagers choice food for gossip, and, even to Jesus, a smile of quiet and humorous appreciation. Is it quite impossible to guess intelligently at what these small happenings were ? “ The genius of (scientific) discovery depends altogether on the number of . . . guesses which visit the investigator’s mind.” But even if Jevons and William James and Mach and Mayer and others of their fraternity had never said such things as that, it is wise to remember that, in the case of the parables already mentioned, without the guess we still remain without the light.

Professor A. B. Bruce, in searching for a reasonable interpretation of the parable of the Labourers, went behind the scenes to the extent of assuming that the householder “ is a humorist and his ways are in some respects very peculiar.” He also assumed that the men taken on at the last hour worked well while those who were employed throughout the day were idle. If we may assume as much as that we may

surely assume whatever we like. We ensure at least some measure of consistency by making the one fundamental assumption in the case of all the parables that have been mentioned. We assume that in them we have actual history. That history must now be reconstructed. We shall suppose then that, not long before Jesus spoke of the Labourers, a landowner in the district had actually employed some workmen, one of whom was something of a rogue. This trickster had adopted a dishonest method of gaining employment at the expense of a fellow-labourer, whom, possibly, he had lured elsewhere on a false scent. He had gone to his job chuckling over his success ; and even if he had not worked his hardest, he had been obliged to stand all day in the sun, and to look as busy as was possible to one of his nature. In a small town news travels fast ; the employer, beginning to enjoy the possibilities of the situation, enrolls other men at various hours of the day. On the principle that we may as well be hanged for a sheep as for a lamb we shall assume that the man originally wronged is among those employed for the last hour only. Pay-time comes at last ; the man defrauded receives a whole day's pay while the man who defrauded him is shrilly insistent on his rights ; the vigorous language used by the employer suggests that this *dénouement* is the explanation of his strange behaviour throughout the day. The schemer and grumbler turns homeward completely disillusioned. Had he only known, he could have been idle practically the whole day ; and still have drawn full pay. For the first time in his life he has been eager to do more work than was necessary. We believe that is the kind of thing that must have happened to produce such a parable as this. To illustrate His lesson Jesus retells a story that is familiar to all His hearers. Their faces shine with happy appreciation of His points. It will be impossible for them to forget the lesson ; the lesson that

while every duty performed out of religious zeal receives its due reward, yet the man who foolishly attempts to cultivate religion for the sake of reward is inevitably disappointed. Despite his zeal—as he terms it—he fares no better than do many who have been less eager. Reward depends on the spirit in which we serve God. It is greatest when we least regard it. Of the parable so read it is no longer true to say “it is not at all obvious how it teaches the lesson which it is expressly intended to set forth.” It is a comprehensive answer to Peter’s question, “What then shall we have?”

When we come to the parable of the Man without a Wedding Garment, we find the same little match indispensable. It is exceedingly difficult to believe the story is a product of our Lord’s imagination. It is so perverse! It does not make clearer the nature of God; it actually suggests He acts from caprice, for the king in the story is a strange mixture of great geniality and ferocious severity. But everything becomes clear if our Lord has taken up a local and familiar story and used that story as a modern cartoonist uses a figure—say—from *Alice in Wonderland*. The picture is familiar; one feature of it is emphasised, not by the artist, but, already, in men’s minds. To that, their thoughts will fly; the cartoonist can afford to leave all other features hazy if that one is quite unmistakable and its lesson impressive. We assume then that a tyrannical ruler, or a still more tyrannical local dignitary, has met with less honour than he expected from a guest, and with all the fury of outraged dignity has taken his revenge. But the “guest’s” fault, however unfortunate in its consequences, was very trifling in its origin. His speechlessness when questioned was no sign of “conscious guilt”; it simply tells us he had no idea of what had brought him there. It was as though someone half-witted, or drunk, or walking in his sleep, had strayed into the festive hall, and had not even

realised that his aimless feet had brought him to an unusual place. He was removed because, in spirit, he was not even present. In spirit he was not present, because he had not given the matter a moment's thought. Jesus had the daring of a man entirely at one with God. He could afford to speak of the Father with a smile upon His face. He does not shrink from using this little tragi-comedy as an illustration. There is a sense in which even the eternal God is forced to act as the king in the story. If men refuse to think, they make Fellowship with Him impossible. They make the eternal God Himself helpless as this insulted king ; and the God such men assume to be on the throne of the world is ridiculous as that. We have not outgrown this story !

Space will not permit of others of these stories being treated in detail. But concerning the selfish neighbour, we may be quite confident there were many of him among our Lord's hearers, or among their acquaintance ! Jesus would never have risked telling that story to men and women who were not already familiar with it. He was able to use it because there was no danger they would confuse the thought of that miserable creature in bed with the thought of God. The centre of the picture is the petitioner, or perhaps the inexpressive door before which he stands. Still more certain is it that the selfish judge had really lived, and been known by them, and had really been wearied into doing one just deed. (The author of *The Syrian Christ* tells us that took place more often than we would suppose.) Were not that the case the parable would have no point. Pilate, Caiaphas, and Herod, in their treatment of Jesus, give us some idea of the satisfaction that a needy suitor might expect to receive at their hands ! Would Caiaphas or any smaller creature decked in official robes ever put himself to inconvenience, if he could avoid it, to further the

interests of a mere widow who not only could not bribe him but had actually angered him? Had Jesus merely manufactured this story it would have been quite without value for His hearers. Their reply, silent or spoken, would have been that such things do not happen. But if on a recent occasion a self-indulgent judge had actually been driven into setting the ears of a whole town a-tingle by doing that which made the background of this parable, then at once Jesus has His opportunity. Surely none of the parables benefits more from our little match than does this one.

Nothing of this seems capable of proof, yet in the case of this last parable it is possible to make a guess which fits in well with another guess; these two guesses provide an appropriate conclusion for a paper composed of such. We read of a poor widow who cast into the treasury two mites—all her living. It is difficult not to believe that Jesus knew this woman personally, otherwise He could not have been sure of the completeness of her penury. Moreover an act such as hers could not be habitual. It was an isolated act; in its way, magnificent as the act of Mary in breaking the cruise of ointment on the feet of Jesus. And our reading of the New Testament leads us to expect that when these things are done in the presence of our Lord, the inspiration for them is to be found in something He has done or said. Is it not likely that this woman was she who importuned the corrupt judge? There is certainly the same energy revealed in the two incidents. Not many poor widows in Jerusalem would have maintained such a fine vitality.

When it seemed she had not a single ally she refused to recognise that injustice possessed any rights or status. She fought single-handed and, astonishingly enough, she won her suit. Jesus hears of the incident and He uses it, as we have seen, in illustration of His teaching. The woman whom, as yet, Jesus has not personally met, happens to be

present ; she hears her own case referred to in illustration of what prayer can do. To the poor soul it means a flood of new light ; she discovers she is no lonely figure in a world that exists merely for the strong or unscrupulous. She is one of the great family of God, who watches tenderly over each member of that family ; the world exists for the sake of those spiritual goods of which Jesus speaks—Love and Justice and Truth. She learns that God desires those things at least as intensely as does she. In the gladness of that discovery she wishes to bring a thank-offering to the Temple ; she mentions it to Jesus because the only gift that she can bring seems trivial and ridiculous. Jesus reassures her and is there to await her coming. It is because He knows the meaning of her act, and all that is behind it, that He is so deeply moved.

S. TONKIN.

HOSANNA.

THIS familiar word, of whose significance I wish to offer an explanation, is found in the Gospel narratives on but two occasions, the one rising out of the other. These were at the triumphal entry of our Lord into Jerusalem on Palm Sunday, where it was the shout of the multitude, and later on the same day, where it was the shout of the children in the Temple.

As the word occurs in Matthew xxi., Mark xi. and John xii. we find the varying forms, "Hosanna to the Son of David"; "Hosanna ; blessed is He that cometh in the name of the Lord"; "Hosanna in the highest."

The word does not occur elsewhere in our English Bible, but the multitudes were quoting in Hebrew from Psalm cxviii. "Save now we beseech Thee, O LORD. Blessed is He that cometh in the name of the LORD." "Save now" is HOSHIA NNA, the latter word being a note of entreaty,

the former the imperative of the verb. As the LXX gives no more indication than the English versions that the word Hosanna is in the Psalm, we see that the multitude, familiar with Hebrew, quoted the Psalm in Hebrew not in Greek.

St. Luke, who is always sparing in his use of Hebrew words, does not quote the word "hosanna," but substitutes "glory." But it is not necessary to take St. Luke as an authority on the significance of Hebrew words.

Rabbinic scholars tell us that these words were quoted with the waving of palm branches at the feast of Tabernacles and that the palm branches on these occasions were called "hosannas." Some modern Jewish scholars maintain that the evangelists are in error in putting this incident at the eve of the Passover instead of at the feast of Tabernacles. But the evidence is too strong for us to surrender this point. But still the question rises, why was the song of one festival transferred to another? We do not sing our Easter hymns at Christmas, nor our Christmas carols at Pentecost.

The explanation that I now make seems very obvious to me, but so far as I can find in the various commentaries and dictionaries at my disposal here, it has not been made before. The two writers in Hastings' Dictionaries, *D.B.* and *D.C.G.* seem just on the point of saying it, but do not say it, and the same may be said of the two commentators on St. Matthew and St. Mark in the I.C.C. series.

My explanation is based on the name Jesus, but not as we have it in either Greek or English but in Hebrew. Where Joshua, the hero of the Conquest, is mentioned in the New Testament the Greek form of his name is the same as the name of our Lord, and this is maintained in A.V. though not in R.V. See Acts vii. 45, and Hebrews iv. 8. Right through the Septuagint the name of Joshua, not only the one already referred to but the three or four others of that name, are called Jesus. To us the name Jesus stands only for One, but

it was not so to His contemporaries, with whom the name Jesus was a household name before He was so named by the angel who appeared to the Virgin in Nazareth, that is so far as they spoke Greek. But this tells us that if the names of our Lord and of the successor of Moses are the same in Greek they are also the same in Hebrew, that is *JEHOSHUA*; the meaning being "Jah is Salvation." The contemporaries of our Lord, we must ever remember, did not call Him Jesus but *JEHOSHUA*, in their native language.

It is thus seen, and we must not lose sight of the fact, that the two words, Jesus and Hosanna, though so unlike in the English and Greek forms that the ordinary reader would never suspect that they were the same derivation, when written in Hebrew are almost the same :—*HOSHIA NNA* and *JEHOSHUA*. Omitting the *nna* in the one case and the *Je* in the other, we see that they differ by but a single vowel, the one being the imperative of the verb to save, the other being the noun derived from the verb—salvation.

When the Lord appeared on His much expected visit to Jerusalem it suddenly dawned on some of the multitude that He whose name was Salvation was the long-looked-for Saviour, and in familiar words, used commonly in another connexion, they cried to Him to save. The variant forms of the cry as recorded in the three Gospels indicate many different shouts, the central meaning of them all being "Son of David, whose name is Saviour, be our Saviour," the repeated use of the word swinging between *HOSHIA* of the Psalm and *HOSHUA*, a variant form of the name of Him who is now publicly entering the city. The gladness of the occasion as they recognise the presence of the long-looked-for Messiah, Saviour, is quite enough to explain what some consider a difficulty, the change of the note of supplication of the Psalm to the unbounded rejoicing of the triumphal entry. They saw that they had reason to rejoice and they rejoiced.

W. HUEY STEELE.

It is with the deepest regret that we record the death of Sir William Robertson Nicoll, C.H., D.D., LL.D., the Editor of the EXPOSITOR from 1885 to 1923.

HODDER & STOUGHTON, LTD.
Proprietors of the EXPOSITOR.

IN MEMORIAM : W. ROBERTSON NICOLL.

I AM writing this far away from any books of reference and unable to consult a file of the EXPOSITOR, but, unless my memory plays me false, when Sir William Robertson Nicoll took over the EXPOSITOR, he soon began to broaden its outlook. Dr. Samuel Cox was a notable expositor. He had the rare gift of expounding the Bible, a gift denied to some scholars of eminence ; he could bring out the salient ideas of any passage without embroidering it with fancy or rhetoric. The original idea of the EXPOSITOR was to pursue this method for the Bible as a whole, to furnish readers and preachers with honest, living interpretations of scripture, to make them understand what they read and then proceed to make others understand. And Sir William never lost sight of his predecessor's track. He used the pages of this journal to serve preachers and teachers of the Bible. He

never intended it to become an antiquarian record. He wanted good scholarship, but scholarship good for something. Often he spoke of the difficulty he found in securing fresh materials for this purpose. "Scholarly articles I can get easily," he used to say, "but who can write expositions now? Who can do for me what Dods did in his day?" Sir William was much concerned about the bearings of the ministry in our age. He wondered sometimes if the pulpit was not forgetting its main functions. Men read essays or delivered semi-political addresses, or gave casual deliverances on current events. Ruskin once wrote about Lord Raglan at the battle of Alma, that "in the first part of the battle he did not know where he was, and in the second plumed himself on being where he had no business to be." Much the same might be said of some modern preachers. They are everywhere except in the place of exposition. They either don't know where they are, doctrinally; or they are proud of advocating propaganda which they have no right to be pressing, if they are as vitally interested as they profess to be in the good fight of the faith. Sir William was conscious of this tendency among his contemporaries in the pulpit, and one of his wholesome desires in editing the EXPOSITOR was to rectify it. But no one was more alert to the newer movements of thought, in religious as well as in literary criticism, and he presently found that this expository work could not be done without casting further afield. In a word he made the EXPOSITOR's range include the context as well as the text of the Bible. He opened its pages to discussions and enquiries which, however remote in appearance, really bore upon the meaning and setting of the Bible; instead of confining it to homiletical matter, he wisely and generously broadened it to cover questions that affected the deeper relation of the modern mind to the Bible as a whole or to special portions

of it. This sagacity enabled him to make the *EXPOSITOR* a medium for bringing fresh and fruitful ideas into circulation among those interested in biblical criticism. An address presented to him some years ago by several Oxford scholars recognises his services in this connexion. He worked, as editor of the *EXPOSITOR*, for progressive thought in the departments of biblical criticism and theological discussion. It has been a piece of good fortune for the religious criticism of the past quarter-of-a-century in this country that Sir William discovered the need of opening the pages of the *EXPOSITOR* to a reverent, forward school of critics, and that he did not restrict his choice of contributors to that or to any one school. Years ago Mark Pattison complained that in theology "the most of Englishmen have no other standard of merit than the prejudices of sect." This is no longer true. And one of the forces which raised the theological level in this country was certainly Sir William's powerful influence as editor of the *EXPOSITOR*. It was an educative influence, in the best sense of the term.

His vital interests in this line were not confined to the *EXPOSITOR*, of course; he had corollaries. He edited the *Expositor's Bible* and the *Expositor's Greek Testament*. The former was a new departure, in advance of anything else along these lines. It was an overflow of the *EXPOSITOR*, and it poured floods of new interest into preaching. The *Greek Testament* had a more restricted audience, but was equally valuable in its own way. What Dean Alford did, single-handed, had to be done by a number of hands, under Sir William's editorship; it was a co-operative enterprise, which he drove with a light hand on the reins. But his dominant aim was the same, to throw fresh light on the exposition of the Bible. He had other projects in his mind, including new volumes of the "Theological Manuals," a series to which Professor Warfield had contributed his book

on Textual Criticism, Professor Dods his New Testament Introduction, and Mr. W. H. Simcox his two books on New Testament Grammar. But these he did not live to carry out. The war, for one thing, hindered them. Still, it is right to acknowledge with real gratitude the work he did accomplish, especially in this journal, by encouraging new writers, by suggesting subjects, and by keeping vital issues to the front. He had an extraordinary perception of what was about to interest the minds of men. And then he steered carefully between the extremes of a technical magazine and a popular, homiletical journal. "Young men of imperfect education," says William de Morgan, "will rush in where philologists and archaeologists fear to tread." Sir William took care that his young men did not rush in till they were educated. He had an editorial horror of crudities. But he also saw to it that philologists and archaeologists did not monopolise his pages. It may seem an easy and obvious task, but it was not easy; it required a trained judgment, and Sir William's supervision was strict and far-sighted. He could repress and he could encourage. He wrote very little in the *EXPOSITOR*. But he overlooked what was written, he insisted on variety and vitality—two qualities of life in any journal; and to his services for detecting vital issues in religious criticism we owe much, far more than some of us always realise.

JAMES MOFFATT.

*THE HISTORICAL BACKGROUND OF THE
DEUTERO-ISAIAH.*

III.

FROM the religion and mythology of Babylonia I now pass to a different subject, viz., Babylonian magic and divination (or soothsaying). Magic is frequently spoken of as though it were an element in religion itself; but Sir James G. Frazer has clearly distinguished between religion and magic, though, as a matter of fact, religion and magic become intertwined and blended with one another. Religion and magic in reality reflect quite distinct attitudes. Religion, as Schleiermacher showed more than eighty years ago, is an attitude of mind which exhibits a relation of dependence on some superhuman or divine power; whereas magic presupposes a relation of control, whether by incantations, or tying of knots, or some other operation, whether over demons or quasi-demons, witches, or other extra-human or abnormal power. Magic or sorcery is therefore the antithesis of religion rather than a genuine element in religion, though it often appears to be blended inextricably with religion.

Magic played an enormous part in the life of both Babylonia and Egypt. It might be regarded in its main aspect as one of the chief means by which men sought, in default of the discovery of scientific method, to solve the problem of evil. It was assumed that evil came to man through evil or destructive powers. The evils of life, physical as well as moral, were generally attributed to demons of many and varied kinds and names. There are the *utukku*, which seems to have been a more or less comprehensive name for demons generally; also the *ekimmu*, which were spirits of the dead which had not yet received the rites of burial,

cut off whether through sword or famine or disease. There was a special demon of fever called *labartu*, of female sex.¹ There was a male demon called *rabīṣu*, a Semitic word familiar to us in its Hebrew form, meaning one who cowers, lurks and lies-in-wait.² The *labasu* and *alḥazu* are other names given to demons of fever. Of course, the night is the time when these demons—as a “pestilence that walketh in darkness”—stalk abroad, and the Semitic word for “night” was given to this demon in the personified name *Lilu*, and we have the feminine counterpart called *lilitu*—sometimes *ardat lili* (servant of *Lilu*)—who might be called the “night-hag.” In Babylonian they appear as storm-demons that rage about during the night like the evil *alu*. The name *lilīth* reappears in a late oracle (probably post-exilian), in the collection called “Isaiah,” which contains a terrible denunciation of doom on Edom (Isa. xxxiv. 14): wild beasts, such as jackals and ostriches, as well as wolves, shall blend with such mythical creatures as the shaggy satyr and *Lilīth* the night-hag, and shall howl during the night in the solitary ruins of Edom’s palaces and fortresses. *Lilīth* became in later Jewish imagination a terrible night-demon that sucked the blood of her sleeping victims.

But I must not delay further with more names of demons.³ They were all ranged under one chief deity of pestilence, *Namtar*. We, in these modern days of the Western world, can have little conception of what the life in the ancient Orient, and even the modern life of the primitive Arab, described by Doughty in his *Arabia Deserta*, resembled.

¹ Jesus “rebuked the fever” (ἐπετμήσεν τῷ πυρετῷ of Simon’s mother-in-law.

² Sin is treated as such (*rôbhēs*) in Genesis iv. 7.

³ Such as *ashakku*, the fever that slinks along in secret; *demetum* the evil curse; *sharabdu* the calumniator, etc. There are 14 of them in *Nergal*’s retinue of helpers of *Tiāmat*. See Otto Weber, *Dämonenbeschwörung bei den Babyloniern u. Assyriern* (*Der alte Orient*), p. 13.

As the ancient Semite faced the great enigma of life with all its dangers and evils, in the tangled mystery of being, unillumined and unexplained by any clear ray of modern science, he had to confront life's perplexities as best he could. He imagined himself surrounded by a great host of evil agencies, both human, in the form of the witch, sorcerer, and evil eye; and superhuman, in the mysterious demons that flitted like ghosts around him and chiefly lurked beneath the ground. Hence arose orders of men of varied kinds, called magicians or sorcerers, who professed to know how to employ methods by which these evil powers could be controlled and coerced. They were in reality priestly in function, as they dealt with heavenly powers—the gods of light, and so blended religion with magic in their incantation rituals. But they also corresponded very closely in their actual relation to society to our own physicians and doctors.

They possessed various titles. Chief among them was the *ashipu*, who might be called the exorciser, a name which has passed into both Hebrew and the closely kindred Aramaic. It was his function to pronounce the *shíptu*, or incantation, and perform the accompanying by-play of which specimens will be given. Another kind of magician which frequently meets us is the *mashmashu*, which is a Sumerian and not a Semitic word (like *ashipu*), and is held to signify one who cleanses or clears the sufferer from the ban, *tabu*, or spell laid upon him. But its real distinction from the *ashipu* is by no means clear. There is mentioned also another member of the magic fraternity, *zannamaru*, a Semitic word akin to those which we find in the Psalms, meaning one who sang or chanted the incantation-ritual. These magicians, like the Hebrew priesthoods, formed close guilds in which the office passed from father to son, just as we find in the Hebrew Levitical priesthoods.

For the interpretation of the incantation-texts which have

come down to us in enormous quantities—mainly from the copies preserved in Ashurbanipal's library—we are chiefly indebted to Tallquist, of the University of Helsingfors, who twenty years ago deciphered and interpreted for us eight tablets of what is called the *Maklu* series of magical texts. The word *maklu*, meaning burning, gives its name to the series, because in the by-play of action which accompanies the incantation, the object against whom the incantation-spell is directed is represented by an image of wax or even bronze, and consigned to the flames. Another incantation-series has been transcribed, translated and explained by Zimmern, in collaboration with Prof. Jansen and our own English scholar, L. W. King. This consists of a series of nine tablets called *Shurpu*, because these also were texts whose recitation was accompanied by the burning of some representative object (cf. Heb. *saraph*). I ought, however, in justice to say that long before Tallquist or Zimmern published their valuable collections of texts, a renowned French scholar, Lenormant, as far back as 1870-74, in his great work *Chaldean Magic*, and other publications, unfolded to us this great world of Babylonian magic.

Jastrow has given us a vivid description of the exorcising process. "The patient had to be prepared for the act. The exorcising priests donned special garments, often in imitation of the gods in whose name they acted. Pieces of flesh and a mixture of dates, flour, honey, and butter, etc., were offered to the demons as bribes that they might thus be more kindly disposed. The rites were generally performed at sunrise or shortly before, though occasionally also at night." (*Relig. in Babyl. and Assy.*, p. 316 sqq.)

Fortunately, we have several pictorial representations on stone or bronze tablets depicting these exorcising rites. The patient lies on a bed at either end of which stands an *ashipu* or *mashmashu*. The seven chief demons, with

threatening faces, are portrayed as well as the protecting deity or deities.

We frequently find in these incantations the name of Marduk mentioned as commanding the spell against the evil power to be uttered, very much as the Hebrew prophet might say, "Thus saith the Lord." But Ishtar and Tammuz are also protective powers that sometimes command the spell. Other names also occur. But the chief counter-acting influences employed to thwart or destroy the evil demon's or sorcerer's power are *fire* and *water*. Here it is impossible not to see that the ancient magician perceived the efficacy of both to destroy or cleanse away the seeds of disease.

Accordingly, one of the gods most frequently invoked is Nusku (or Girru), the fire-god. The long incantation (second in the Maklû series) opens with a stately invocation of Nusku :

"Nusku, great God, prince of the great gods,
Guardian of the libations of all heavenly spirits,
Founder of cities, restorer of sanctuaries,
Bright day whose command is exalted,
Messenger of Anu, thou who obeyest Bel's decision,
Mighty in battle, whose advance is powerful,
Nusku, burner, that overpowerest foes." . . .

These words, and even further invocations, would be repeated by the *ashipu*. Then would follow verses to be whispered in a low tone by the sufferer after the *ashipu*, or magician priest. An image of the victim of the incantation, made either of wax, honey-paste, clay, or even of bronze, would stand close by, to be devoted to the flames while the words of the spell are pronounced :

"I turn to thee, I implore thee, raise my hands to thee, I sink down
at thy feet ;
Burn the sorcerer and the sorceress ;
Blast the life of the dreaded sorcerer and the sorceress ;
Let me live to gladden thy heart and humbly pay homage to
thee."

Each of these incantation texts contains a series of spells. Among those contained in the second incantation text, I select another still more vivid (col. iii. 148 seq.). The sufferer's afflictions are described probably by the sufferer himself repeating the words in a low whisper after the *ashipu* or magician :

“ They have used all kinds of charms
To entwine me as with ropes,
To catch me as in a bird's snare,
To tie me as with cords,
To overpower me as in a net,
To throttle me as with a noose,
To tear me as a fabric.”

An image, made apparently of oily sesame-meal, is standing by, and the magician then proceeds to tie his knots around the image and slowly utters the words :

“ But I by the command of Marduk, Lord of Charms,
By Marduk the master of bewitchment,
Both the sorcerer and the sorceress
As with ropes I will entwine,
As with a bird's snare I will catch,
As in a net I will overpower,
As in a noose I will throttle,
As a fabric I will tear.”

Here we have a good example of what is called sympathetic magic, of which the Old Testament, in its descriptions of prophecy in its earlier stages, furnishes vivid illustrations. We remember the striking scene before the two kings of Northern and Southern Israel before the battle of Ramoth-Gilead, when one of the court prophets, Zedekiah, son of Kena'nah, reassured Ahab by bringing horns of iron, saying, “ Thus saith Yahweh, with these shalt thou push the Syrians until they be consumed ” (1 Kings xxii. 11). We remember also the other vivid scene by Elisha's death-bed, when Israel's fortunes had fallen very low, and both Israel and Judah had been conquered by Syria. Joash, king of

Israel, visits the dying prophet and is commanded by him to shoot Yahweh's victorious arrow in the northerly direction toward Syria, and he is also bidden to strike several times on the floor (2 Kings xiii. 17 seq.). We have other instances which recur to us in the ministry of Jeremiah and Ezekiel,¹ in which sympathetic magic passes into a concrete or material symbol, which might be regarded as quasi-magical.

The range and depth to which magic, with its accompanying belief in the demons of the dark underworld of evil, penetrated into every corner of Babylonian life can only be grasped when we realise the vast number of magical tablets, with their weird and fantastic incantation-rituals, which have come to us from the wrecks of Ashurbanipal's library, and are stored in the British museum. Magical incantations, in fact, in those days formed an indispensable part of medicine or the healing art. Accompanying the incantation there would be the application of drugs and herbs. I take one example from Mr. Campbell Thompson's *Semitic Magic*,² a spell against toothache. It is based, as we see, on an ancient belief, still existing in Mesopotamia, China and the Malay, that tiny worms ancestors apparently of the microbe! - eat the teeth. This incantation begins with a fragment of cosmogony :

“After Anu [had created the Heavens],
The Heavens created [the Earth],
The earth created the rivers,
The rivers created the canals,
The canals created the marshes,
The marshes created the worm,
Came the worm (and) wept before the Sun-God.

¹ Jeremiah xix. 1-10 ; xxviii. 4, 11-14 ; and especially Ezekiel iv. 1 sqq., in which a tablet is inscribed to portray the siege of Jerusalem.

² p. xliii., and also in his earlier work, with transcribed text, in *The Devils and Evil Spirits of Babylonia*, vol. ii., pp. 160-163. In his later work, one or two corrections in rendering are introduced.

Before Ea came her tears :
 ' What wilt thou give me for my food,
 What wilt thou give me for my devouring ? '
 ' I will give thee ripe figs
 And scented . . wood ' (?)
 ' What are these ripe figs to me,
 Or scented . . wood ? (?)
 Let me drink among the teeth
 And set me on the gums (?)
 That I may devour the blood of the teeth
 And of their gums (?) destroy the strength (?)
 Then shall I hold the bolt of the door.'
 Since thou hast said this, O worm,
 Ea shall smite thee with the might of his fist."

Ritual for this :—Mix fermented drink, the plant *sakilbir* and oil together, repeat the incantation three times and put it on his tooth.

Hitherto we have dealt with incantations on their lower non-ethical side, with one solitary exception, when I quoted from an opening invocation of the fire-god Nusku. But incantations had also their higher ethical side. To borrow a phrase of Dr. Marett, we pass by insensible gradations from spell to genuine prayer.¹ There is one very remarkable incantation, the second in the *Sharpu* series (edited by Zimmern), which begins. "I appeal to the great gods, god and goddess, lords of deliverance." The suppliant seeks for deliverance from his evils and reconciliation with the great gods Shamash, Marduk, Nergal, Ea, and others, by a long enumeration, occupying some 120 lines in the form of questions, of the sins which the suppliant may have possibly committed and so brought down Divine wrath upon himself :

"Has he insulted his god . . . insulted his goddess ?
 Has he given refusal for compliance . . . for compliance refusal ?
 Has he pointed with the finger ?
 Has he spoken baleful words ?
 Has he contemned his goddess ?
 Has he spoken evil ?
 Has he uttered impurity ?

¹ The phrase is borrowed from the title of a suggestive paper contributed by Dr. R. R. Marett to *Folklore*, vol. xv. (1904), pp. 132 sqq.

Has he caused injustice to be spoken ?
 Has he caused a judge to receive a bribe ?

Has he alienated father from son ?
 Has he alienated son from father ?
 Has he alienated mother from daughter ?
 Has he alienated daughter from mother ? . . . ?

Has he alienated brother from brother ?

Has he alienated friend from friend ?

Has he alienated associate from associate ?

Has he not set a prisoner free—not released one that is bound ?

Not let an imprisoned one see the light of day ? . . .

Is there transgression against his god—misconduct towards his goddess ?

Outrage towards his ancestor—hate against his elder brother ?

Contemned father and mother—insulted elder sister ? ”

And so the recital of delinquencies—social sins—proceeds in a long catalogue, with the following supplication at the close :

“ May there come release, Shamash—thou judge !

Release, O Shamash, Lord of what is above and beneath,

Thou who art the leader of the gods—king of lands,

At Thy word may justice be done.”

I must now speak of the great world of divination or soothsaying. The art of divination, or attempt to forecast the future, is simply due to the fact that man forms plans or purposes, and endeavours to secure conditions that are favourable for the execution of his projects, whether it be marriage, building a house, or a military expedition. Since the course of future events is controlled by the deity or deities, it is important to know whether he or they are favourable to the design, so that good conditions for the success of the project may be secured.

All the nations of antiquity, including the Hebrews, possessed their soothsayers or diviners. Among the Hebrews there were various kinds of soothsayers, including the necromancer, and what was called in early days the “ seer.” From an interesting passage in Isaiah (iii. 2) we learn that

the soothsayer (or diviner) occupied an important place in the higher ranks of society, alongside of the judge, the commander-in-chief, and the prophet. It is not until we come to the days of Josiah's reformation that we find all the various kinds of soothsayer suppressed by religious enactment (Deut. xviii. 10-14). The people were commanded to look for direction to the divinely inspired prophet whom God would never fail to raise up for the guidance of His people (verse 15).

Babylonia, as might be expected, swarmed with soothsayers. Chief among these was the *barû* ; and we know that these *barûte*, or soothsayers, formed a special guild, the existence of which can be traced back at least as far as the time of Hammurabi (2000 B.C.). The verb *barû* in Babylonian means to see, look at or inspect, and hence to prophesy. The substantive *barû* is therefore not unlike the Hebrew word for "seer" (*rô'eh*).

What the *barû* inspected, with a view to giving a favourable or unfavourable response to the inquirer, was the *liver* of an animal (chiefly a sheep). Hence, the name *barû* is very similar to the Latin *extispex*, or inspector of entrails. This may seem a strange object to inspect with a view to discovering omens or signs. But when I say that the liver which was inspected belonged to an *animal sacrificed to the deity*, from whom the inquiry was being made, and whose favour was being sought in respect of the plan or enterprise of the inquirer, we begin to have some clue as to the significance of these investigations of the liver.

Before anything was known of the great importance of the heart as the centre of the circulatory system—indeed, far before anything whatever was known about the nervous system and the primary position of the brain, the large organ so prominent in the intestines and absorbing about one-sixth of the blood, was held to be the most central

and vital organ, most closely related to the blood which ancient nations, including the Hebrews, held to be the life. Now, the liver of a sacrificed animal was supposed to be in some mysterious way identified with the life and mind of the god to whom it was sacrificed, and so would bear indubitable marks of the deity's mind. Consequently careful investigation of the liver in every part, however minute, including the gall-bladder and all its ducts, every feature having its special name, was the specialty and function of the *barû*. In fact, the entire system and its elaboration would take far too much time to describe. There were schools for training young *barû* priests in this system of liver-divination. This was chiefly based on large collections of old records, omen-tablets belonging to the reigns of Sargon I. and his successor Naram-Sin, who reigned about 2500 B.C. I now quote from Prof. Morris Jastrow, who devotes 200 pages in one of his three volumes in the larger edition of his work on the religion of the Babylonians and Assyrians entirely to this branch of the subject.

He says, "This collection illustrates an important principle in the method adopted for interpreting the signs; it was argued that if on a certain occasion, let us say before an attack on the ancient enemy, Elam, the gall-bladder, the various ducts and lobes and markings, showed certain features, and the result of the battle was a victory for Sargon, the proof was furnished *de facto* that these were favourable signs."¹ It is enough to say on this part of the subject that when a ruler had any important enterprise projected, he would consult his *barû*, or liver inspector, who, after sacrificing the sheep, would carefully inspect the markings of its liver, and then, after consulting the older authorities to which I have referred, present his report to

¹ Cited from Jastrow's smaller work, *Religion in Babylonia and Assyria*, p. 169. See, for other examples, especially p. 186.

the ruler in which the particular appearances on the liver would be noted, and the special conclusion drawn as to whether they were favourable to the undertaking of the enterprise or not. The whole system of liver inspection is called by the technical term *Hepatoscopy*.¹

Omens were also derived from the observation of other objects; e.g., there was oil divination. Oil was poured into a basin of water, and then the bubbles were observed, and the rings formed by the oil. We have also divination from the movements of animals, such as dogs, or the flight of birds, or monstrosities of birth. We have also divination from dreams.

But more important than any of these, as means of arriving at a knowledge of the future, was the observation of the heavenly bodies or astrology. From very early prehistoric days the Semites worshipped both sun and moon; and, among at least a portion of them, the Babylonians, living in close conjunction with the Sumerians, this worship must have extended to Venus, Jupiter, Mars, Saturn, Mercury, the visible planets, and then to fixed stars or constellations. In course of time, as the regular movements of these heavenly bodies were noted, the idea began to prevail of a co-ordination between the phenomena of the heavens and events on earth. The close connexion between the movements of the sun, as well as the position

¹ See the significant passage in Ezekiel xxi. 26 (A.V. 21) in which the King of Babylon stands at the cross-roads and among other modes of divination "looked in the liver." Hehn (*Die Bibl. u. die Babyl. Gottesidee*, p. 318) is quite wrong in assuming that the ritual reference to the "caul or fatty portion by the liver" in Exodus xxix. 13, 22, etc. [called also by Driver on Exodus xxix. 13 the *appendix* or *lobus caudatus*] "involved a protest against this form of divination," because this among other portions was to be burned. The term used for burning in these passages is not the ordinary *saraph*, but the highly ritual and sacred *hiktîr*, which was the very reverse, since it became "a sweet savour to Yahweh." The passages are significant in showing the importance attached to the portions about the liver.

of certain constellations with the yearly seasons, the condition of the weather, and the productivity of the earth would at once suggest such a correlation. And when the heavenly bodies were deified and so endowed with controlling power, the inference became quite natural that changes in the heavens portended changes on earth, and so a clue to the events of the future could be obtained by observing celestial phenomena. This it was the function of the *barû*, or inspector, not only of the marks of the liver, but of the signs in the heavens, to obtain. Properly speaking, these observations extended not only to the stars, but to storms, clouds, thunder and lightning.

With reference to the observation of the stars and the conclusions that were drawn, the same principles were adopted that were employed in the liver-omens. A vast number of past recorded observations were kept, and if on some particular occasion a favourable issue, as the defeat of the enemy, followed on a particular conjunction of weather-signs or position of the stars, then it would be inferred that if that conjunction arose again, the issue would be favourable. In addition to this, the astrologers divided the world for their purposes into North, South, East and West, which for them naturally meant Elam on the East, Amurru, or land of the Amorites, on the West, Akkad, or Babylonia, on the South, and Subartu, or Gutî, on the North. This must have taken place before 2000 B.C. since Assyria is not mentioned. The planet Jupiter was then specially associated with Akkad, or Babylonia, since it was planet of the god Marduk; while the planet Mars, associated with the destructive deity Nergal, was connected with the two hostile countries Elam and Amurru.

Also we have lists in which planets and constellations are arranged in groups of twelve, corresponding to the twelve months of the year, and are divided among these four

regions, Elam, Akkad, Amurru and Subartu (Gutî). We have also the days of the month referred to one country or other, so that nearly every appearance in the sky was associated with some country. The 1st, 5th, 9th, 13th, etc., days were assigned to Akkad; the 2nd, 6th, 10th, 14th, etc., to Elam; the 3rd, 7th, 11th, 15th, etc., to Amurru, and the 4th, 8th, 12th, 16th, etc., to Subartu (Gutî). This again, as will be understood, is a vast and complicated subject to which Jastrow devotes 330 pages of his large octavo volumes on the Religion of Babylonia and Assyria.

Hitherto I have endeavoured to give a slight sketch of the deep religious life of Babylonia which produced so profound an influence on the great world of the Persian Empire that followed it and of the Hellenic Empire that followed the Persian. That it must have deeply impressed the Jewish exile, as we know in centuries long past it deeply impressed the whole of Western Asia even beyond the Mediterranean, surely goes without saying. How did that puny Jewish race meet this vast tide of foreign influence that swept around it in the land of exile with all their national hopes blighted and their capital and the temple of Yahweh destroyed? We know what eventually happened to their kinsmen of the Northern tribes whom Sargon deported Eastwards after the capture of Samaria nearly two centuries before. They remained for a time in the land of exile, and the hopes of Jeremiah and Ezekiel pointed to a happy day of future re-union. But the hopes were vain, and the Northern tribes in exile became absorbed into surrounding populations and disappeared. Why did not a like fate attend the Jews? How did Judaism survive this crisis and others that were to follow? for we have the great Jewish Diaspora growing in numbers, power and influence among us still.

(1) In the first place, we note a profound difference between the Yahweh of the Hebrew and the polytheism of Babylonia. Hehn (*op. cit.* pp. 272-288) rightly lays stress on the distinguishing fact that Yahweh was the God of the central covenant of Horeb, established by Moses, who had revealed Himself to Israel in the mighty story of their past deliverance from Egypt and the conquest of Canaan. Yahweh was constantly revealing Himself to Israel. It was around the "ark of the Covenant" that the scattered tribes of the Hebrew federation rallied in times of peril and war. Yahweh was their bond of unity and of victory, or salvation - He and no other, and He would tolerate no rival. This monotheism, based on past history, was a strong fortress against the polytheism (henotheism ?) of Babylonia, however stately and picturesque. The Pantheon of Babylonia consisted of nature deities, which were likewise local, and attained to supremacy with the supremacy of the place to which they were attached. Nor did the supremacy of one such as Marduk exclude the existence and power of others, though it might appear to absorb them. But Yahweh was spiritual and stood *alone*.

(2) It must be remembered that Judah, through the teaching of Judæan prophets, had already survived in its religious history other crises in the past. Herein Judah surpassed Ephraim. When the oncoming tide of Assyrian invasion threatened in the eighth century to submerge nations and, with the submergence or deportation of the people, to destroy the prestige and power of its patron deity, it was the Judæan prophet Amos, as well as his younger contemporary Isaiah, who emphasised the conception of Yahweh as the *universal Lord of all nations whose character was righteousness*, and whose claim on man was for righteous conduct rather than ceremonial. These were not wholly new conceptions. They lay implicit in the old national traditions of Israel since the

days of Moses. But the emphasis was something new, and the universality of Yahweh's sovereignty and the ethical character of His nature and claim lifted His nature and worship above the limitations of country or of race. He was Lord of all the world and not Israel only. It was reserved for puny and politically insignificant Judah to receive this priceless teaching. No other race — certainly not Egypt, Assyria, or Babylonia — possessed this unsurpassed order of inspired men, the prophets.

What Amos, Isaiah and Micah had begun in the eighth century, Jeremiah completed in the seventh. When the doom of Jerusalem and of Yahweh's temple was at hand and the ruin of David's throne and people, it was reserved for Jeremiah to enunciate his doctrine of the New Covenant which substituted a religion that was personal, internal and spiritual for a religion based on written enactments and on the external social bond (Jer. xxxi. 31 sqq.). Thus the religion of Yahweh was placed on eternal spiritual foundations which no shocks of time could destroy or even disturb.

(3) Lastly, while Jeremiah seemed to most a prophet of political despair, even an antipatriot, he was also the prophet of hope and held forth to his countrymen the sure expectation of a return to Judah from the land of exile (xxix. 14, xxxii.). This message of hope was sustained in the land of exile by his younger contemporary, Ezekiel, whose glowing imagery and inspiring eloquence held the Jewish exiled community fast by the river Chebar. The genius of Ezekiel differed greatly from that of Jeremiah. It turned to the practical and external side of the religious life of the Jew. As the prophet of hope, in the early days of the exile, he set forth before his countrymen bright visions of a restored Divine commonwealth, in which all Israel's tribes should have their place in the old holy land and the temple, with renovated splendour, and surrounding abodes

and domains for the priests should be situate in the midst of a purified and holy people.

Such were the influences which served to stem the great tide of disintegration to which the Jews in exile were exposed at least during the earlier period of the exile.

Yet these disintegrating influences must have increased as the years went by. And they operated the more powerfully when we remember that the Jews as a people spoke a Semitic language, like the Babylonians themselves, though obviously not the same. Moreover, even in Babylonia, not only Babylonian, but also Aramaic, was very largely spoken, and Aramaic would be familiar to the elders among the Jews (2 Kings xviii. 26). There were, therefore, many points of contact between the Babylonians and the resident Jewish population. It must also be remembered that not a few among the exiles were disloyal to Yahweh and, like their brothers and sisters who accompanied Jeremiah to Egypt, were worshippers of Ashtoreth. Further, it must be recollected that necromancy and magic had been practised among Hebrews as well as Canaanites in the old homeland. So prevalent was the practice among women that special legislation in the older codes (Exod. xxii. 18) as well as in Deuteronomy (xviii. 10-12) was directed against it. Even in the early days of the exile the magical practices of the Babylonians had corrupted the women among the Jewish exiles. It is impossible to read Ezekiel's denunciation (xiii. 18 sqq.) of the women who sew bands (evidently a kind of amulet), and make magic "veils over their heads to hunt souls," without seeing in these customs of Jewish sorceresses the influence of their Babylonian sisters, described in Tallquist's introduction to his edition of the *Maklû*-series of incantations.¹

¹ Introd. § 4, 1, pp. 15 sqq. The contaminating influence of Babylonian cults is clearly indicated in parabolic form in Ezekiel xxiii. 14-18.

Ezekiel did not prophesy after 570 B.C. When his voice and rare personal influence passed away,¹ and there was no sign that the Babylonian domination was vanishing and the exiles' restoration to the home-land was impending, a very serious crisis for the Jew's religion must have arisen. We must bear in mind that the loftier views respecting Yahweh's character as universal sovereign and righteous judge, inculcated by the great Jewish prophets, were not the ordinary popular conception. Popular religion was still held within the limitations of nationalism. *Yahweh was Israel's national and tutelary deity*, the leader of Israel's armies, whose sacred rites of sacrifice could only be maintained in the old sacred homeland. Yahweh's temple had been destroyed and Yahweh was evidently devoid of all power. Marduk, the lord of Babylon, was stronger than he. The logic of events seemed to prove this. The decay of the Yahweh-religion in the great foreign land and the adoption of the cults of the conqueror's gods would be natural consequences. The women who worshipped Ashtoreth in the homeland would worship the same deity under the name Ishtar in Babylonia. Already in the lifetime of Ezekiel we have seen Jewish sorceresses adopting the magic rites of the land of their adoption.

There still remained a band of faithful adherents of the God of their fathers, who remembered the Yahweh of the exodus-journey and the deliverance wrought in olden times. These faithful servants of Yahweh would be consolidated into a yet firmer bond of union by the hostile attitude of their Babylonian rulers. Not once, nor twice, has it happened in Israel's strange and tragic history as a scattered race, that *Judenhetze*—familiar to the Jew on the continent, but fortunately not in free England—has tended to counter-

¹ The charm of his eloquence is compared to a love-song, Ezekiel xxxiii. 32; cf. the entire section, vv. 30-33.

act those disintegrating and solvent influences of foreign surroundings, civilisation, intellectual influences and religion that undermine and destroy the religion and ancient traditions of the Jew. Persecution strengthens the Jewish hold on his religion, and so it evidently was during the latter part of the exile. The attitude of Jeremiah towards Babylonia and his counsel to the Jewish exiles in the early days of the first deportation after 597 B.C. (xxvi.-xxviii., xxix. 1-9). The language of high approval employed by Ezekiel regarding Nebuchadrezzar (xvii. 11-16, xix. 9, xxvi. 7 seq., xxix. 18-20, xxx. 1 seq., 24 seq.) were exchanged for a very different note after the strong and wise administration of Nebuchadrezzar, which was probably characterised by tolerance towards the Jewish exiles, had passed by.

Nebuchadrezzar was succeeded by rulers who were personally weak, viz. :—

Amil-Marduk (Evil Merodach, 2 Kings xxv. 27 seq.), of whom we possess no cuneiform records, reigned 561-559, and was murdered in revolt by his brother-in-law.

Nergal Sharezer (Nergal-shur-uşur), 559-556, whose inscriptions merely record building operations.

Labashi-Marduk (556-5), son of above, assassinated after nine months.

Nabonidus (properly Nabu-nāīd, son of Nabû-balatsu-iḫbi), who rebuilt many of the ancient temples, and eventually attempted to centralise all Babylonian worships in Babylon by putting an end to local worships and transplanting them to Babylon. This greatly incensed the local priesthood. Nabonidus, the last king of Babylon, reigned from 555 to 538 B.C.

Probably the policy of tolerance towards the Jews who remained faithful to their worship of Yahweh, and main-

tained the distinctive rite of circumcision practised by the Western Semites, but not by the Babylonians, ceased after Nebuchadrezzar's death in 561 B.C., and was succeeded by a policy of severe repression. This will account for the strain of bitter denunciation in the long oracles appended to the Jeremiah collection, l. 1-li. 64, none of which, in my opinion, has any connexion with Jeremiah and must be assigned, like Isaiah xlvii., which breathes a like spirit of bitter hostility to Babylon, to the close of the exile period.

In fact, the last fifteen years of the exile period—say from 555-538—must have been a time of great strain to the faith of the Jewish community. Probably many were the lapses from the Jewish religion into Babylonian heathenism; thus faith in Yahweh and in the oracles of Jeremiah and Ezekiel, who had long passed away, must have given place in many waiting and anxious hearts to hopelessness and despair.

It was then, in the crisis of the people's agonizing need, that there arose those voices in the midnight darkness which we hear in the Deutero-Isaiah. It is easy to see that there lurks in the background the seductive call of Babylonian heathenism. Against this the prophet speaks. Against the exaltation of Babylon's god of light, Marduk, the supreme Lord of Heaven and creator of the world, Yahweh is set forth as "He that sitteth above the circle of the earth, and the inhabitants thereof are as grasshoppers" . . . "who stretches out like fine gauze the heavens—that bringeth out their host by number." We see the great Hebrew cosmogony—simpler and nobler—in place of the old Babylonian. This God, "the creator of the ends of the earth, does not faint nor is weary," though the signs of the times may seem to point the other way. All through these troublous times His care for Israel has never ceased. "They that wait upon Him shall renew their strength."

The Deutero-Isaiah constantly emphasises the sole and unrivalled supremacy of Yahweh, and the utter impotence of all foreign deities, on whose images and their image-makers he pours the bitterest scorn. This is a constantly recurring theme (xl. 12-17, 21-23; xli. 4, 5; xliii. 9-13, etc.).

Yahweh is not only the Lord of space, but also of time. In one notable passage (xli. 21 sqq.) Yahweh even challenges the Babylonian deities to come to judgment. "Bring forward your suit, advance your proofs." We are here to think more especially of Nebo who "bore the tablets of destiny." Yahweh utters the challenge: "Declare the things that are coming in the future, that we may know that you are God; yea, do things good or bad that we may look at one another in amaze and fear." With these words the striking prophecy of the advent of the conqueror Cyrus (xli. 25 sqq.) is introduced as one who is to come from the North.

In chapter xlvi. we have the direct attack on *Marduk* by name (under his title Bel), and on Nebo, the deity whose sanctuary was in Borsippa. It is easy to discern the picturesque background of the annual procession along the sacred way at the Akitu or New Year festival to which reference has already been made (p. 329). The heavy images are borne as a load by the weary beast. But this time it is to be no festal or triumphant procession. Bel is to bow low in humiliation and Nebo is to stoop, for the images of the deities are to be overtaken and captured by the enemies of Babylon.

The downfall of the city is clearly foreseen, and is the theme of the next chapter (chap. xlvii.), which is in the metre of a Hebrew dirge (*kīnah*), in which the luxurious and arrogant lady Babylon, haughty and cruel, is destined to go into captivity as an abject slave girl. What will all her magic and soothsaying avail her then?

“ Yea, evil shall come upon thee that thou knowest not how to avert by incantation. Abide by thy spells and thy many incantations, whereby thou weariedst thyself from thy youth up. Perhaps thou art able to win advantage. Perhaps thou wilt scare away thy foes. Thou art weary with thy many counsellors. May they stand by you and save you, who divide the heavens, the gazers at the stars ” (vv. 12 seq.).

The description of the magic and soothsaying of the Babylonians, which has been given in this section, is the best commentary that can be offered upon the allusions in the pungent satire of this taunt-song.

OWEN C. WHITEHOUSE.

PAUL'S ADDRESS BEFORE THE COUNCIL AT JERUSALEM.

IN a former article we set forth certain reasons for believing that the substance of Paul's speech before the Council at Jerusalem is embodied in the first eleven chapters of the epistle to the Romans. We dealt then largely with the external evidence in favour of our hypothesis: our present purpose is to examine these chapters carefully to ascertain what internal indications there may be to corroborate our theory.

At first sight it would appear almost an act of reckless folly for the apostle to have expected a verdict in his favour from James and the narrow-minded Palestinian Jews in Jerusalem; but from the repeated reference in these chapters to the earlier Jacobean epistle, which Zahn tells us Paul had read very carefully, we come to the conclusion that there was a far more substantial agreement among the leaders of the infant church than most critics would allow. Two things gave St. Paul confidence to bring his

case before the Council, his ability to prove his contention by an appeal to the authority of the Hebrew Scriptures, and the knowledge that, on his previous visit to Jerusalem at the time of famine, James, Peter and John, in a private interview, had admitted to him that the teaching of Jesus justified his wider interpretation of the gospel. Like Luther at Wörms, Paul appealed to an authority ulterior to that of the Council. The German miner's son demanded that he be convicted of error from the page of Holy Scripture : the tentmaker of Tarsus, from the mouth of Jesus. Because both knew that the higher authority was in their favour, they stood bold and unbending in the presence of their fellows. Only thus could the apostle reconcile his appearance at the Council with his previous declaration to the Galatians that his gospel was not after man, nor received of man, but by the revelation of Jesus Christ.

St. Paul begins his address before the Council with the statement of the thesis he was ready to defend before them. *I am not ashamed of the gospel : for it is the power of God unto Salvation to every one that believeth ; to the Jew first, and also to the Greek. For therein is revealed a righteousness of God by faith unto faith : as it is written, But the righteous shall live by faith.*¹ The Judaisers had begun the deliberations of the Council by a ruthless criticism of the teaching of the apostle, and in rising to reply we can understand why he should declare he was not ashamed of the gospel. The doctrines which they had ignorantly attacked were in very truth the message of Jesus, bearing the seal of their validity in their demonstrated power to save men from sin. James had, in the letter which he had circulated among congregations of the Jewish Dispersion a few

¹ The first fifteen verses of the epistle are obviously the introduction which was appended to the address when it was later circulated among the churches.

years before, spoken of τὸν ἔμφυτον λόγον τὸν δυνάμενον σῶσαι τὰς ψυχὰς ὑμῶν ; and with evident reference to this remark of James, Paul claims that the gospel he is preaching has the same characteristic mark, δύναμις γὰρ θεοῦ ἐστὶν εἰς σωτηρίαν παντὶ τῷ πιστεύοντι. Can it be merely a coincidence that the apostle in this brief enunciation of his theme should speak of that δικαιοσύνη θεοῦ, the very identical words which had been in the mouth of James just before he had mentioned the saving power of the engrafted word ?

In his opening words St. Paul, as a skilled tactician, is seeking to win for himself the good will of the Council. He has made reference to the letter of James to show that there is a strong resemblance between the gospel he is preaching, and the message of Jesus. Moreover, in itself there is nothing revolutionary in his doctrine of justification by faith. The Hebrews esteemed faith very highly, and by using the Septuagint version of the Old Testament, the apostle is able to support his thesis by no less an authority than the prophet Habakkuk. But once his interpretation of the gospel as the righteousness of God by faith is accepted without protest, Paul sets himself to prove that the whole of his teaching, even those parts to which so grave objection has been taken, is implicitly contained therein.

Following this brief enunciation of his theme, the apostle goes on to his general introduction, the terrible depravity of the Gentile world. St. Paul well knew the susceptibilities of the audience with which he is dealing. He understood at first hand their racial prejudice and religious pride, and as a Jew speaking to Jews he gave vent to the usual polemics of his race against the sinners of the Gentiles. Paul could have found no subject more congenial to his hearers, and no sentiments more in keeping with their traditional theology, and he made full use of the rich copious-

ness of the Greek language to emphasize the awful enormity of the crimes of which heathen nations were guilty. Although there are certain resemblances in this passage to the language of the Old Testament, there was no need to quote Scriptural authority to prove to a Jewish audience the prodigality of the Gentiles. To them, the truth of his charges was self-evident. We can almost visualise the eager interest on each face as they listen to that damnatory indictment of heathen iniquity: we can almost imagine we can hear the enthusiastic applause which greeted every telling phrase. Clearly, a man, who could speak with such conviction of the sins of that outside Gentile world, had proved himself a loyal and patriotic Jew.

No sooner had the apostle got this sympathetic grip upon his audience than, like a flash of lightning, he hurls upon them the unexpected challenge: *Thou art without excuse, O man, whosoever thou art that judgest; for wherein thou judgest another, thou condemnest thyself: for thou that judgest dost practise the same things. And we know that the judgment of God is according to truth against them that practise such things. And reckonest thou this, O man, who judgest them that practise such things and doest the same, that thou shalt escape the judgment of God?* In the first nine verses of the second chapter, Paul is seeking to prove the equality of Jew and Gentile as sinners before God. This is the danger zone of his whole argument, and he realises that he will never cross it in safety unless he can substantiate his thought by some authority these Jews dare not question. Had not their sacred writings declared that there is no respect of persons with God? ¹ Jesus, whom they professed to follow, had said, "Not every one that saith unto me, Lord, Lord, shall enter into the Kingdom

¹ 2 Chron. xix. 12; Rom. ii. 11.

of heaven, but he that doeth the will of my Father which is in heaven." ¹

It was no theoretic charge, no vague accusation, no haphazard guess with which he confronts these Jews. He is prepared to lay detailed charges before the Council. He knows those of their number who are guilty of theft, he can name some who are immoral in their lives, yea he can point to them, who, though they speak with scorn of the heathen images, have enriched themselves by acting as receivers of goods stolen from a temple. Can we imagine that these charges were written in the calm seclusion of some study? Do they not have all the appearance of a spoken challenge, made face to face to an audience which contained quite a number of Jews? *Circumcision indeed profiteth if thou be a doer of the law: but if thou be a transgressor of the law, thy circumcision is become uncircumcision. If therefore the uncircumcision keep the ordinances of the law, shall not his uncircumcision be reckoned for circumcision? and shall not the uncircumcision which is by nature, if it fulfil the law, judge thee, who with the letter and circumcision art a transgressor of the law? For he is not a Jew, which is one outwardly: neither is that circumcision, which is outward in the flesh: but he is a Jew, which is one inwardly: and circumcision is that of the heart, in the spirit, not in the letter: whose praise is not of men, but of God.* The judgment Paul is appealing to is not that of the Council but of the law,² and of the prophets,³ and of Him who marvelled at the faith of a Roman soldier, and had declared, "I have not found so great faith, no, not in Israel." ⁴

The apostle now turns to reply to certain objections which have been raised against his gospel. It has been argued that no doubt this is a way of presenting the dialectic

¹ Matt. vii. 21; Rom. ii. 13.

² Deut. x. 16.

³ Jer. ix. 26.

⁴ Luke vii. 9.

tical process in his own mind, but we prefer to think that the difficulties were pressed upon the speaker in actual debate. The traditional destination and date of this epistle have seemingly kept certain critics from recognising the true historical setting of the address. They frankly tell us that these chapters have all the characteristics of a spoken address, that the argument is conducted by a quick cut and thrust of dialectic, which reminds us of a fencer with his eye always on his antagonist.¹ Our opinion of the immediateness of the questions is confirmed by the fact that the apostle only gives brief replies at the moment of interruption, and returns later to discuss the difficulties at greater length. We surmise that St. Paul asked that he be heard on the problems raised at another session of the Council. Only some such explanation will satisfactorily account for the return to the same questions in a later portion of the same address. The apostle solves the first difficulty by saying that the possession of the promises of God constitutes the advantage of the Jew. To the second question, he makes answer that the unbelief of man can never make void the pledged word of God, and to the third is given the quick denial that he has ever taught that evil may be done for the sake of good.

When the apostle has thus briefly disposed of these difficulties, he returns to his main argument, the equal condemnation of Jew and Gentile; and after the manner of a rabbi he drives home his conclusion by a long string of quotations from the sacred writings (compare Ps. xiv. 2-4; liii. 1-4; v. 9; cxl. 3; x. 7; Isa. xlix. 7, 8; Ps. xxxvi. 1; cxliii. 2; Eccles. vii. 20; Jer. xxiii. 5, 6 with Rom. iii. 10-26). What is written cannot be called in question. As none has perfectly kept the law, no flesh by the law can be justified in his sight. *But now apart from the law a*

¹ Sanday and Headlam, Rom. p. lviii.

*righteousness of God hath been manifested, being witnessed by the law and the prophets : even the righteousness of God through faith in Jesus Christ unto all them that believe ; for there is no distinction : for all have sinned, and fall short of the glory of God ; being justified freely by his grace through the redemption that is in Christ Jesus : whom God set forth to be a mercy seat (ἱλαστήριον), through faith, by His blood, to shew His righteousness, because of the passing over of the sins done aforetime, in the forbearance of God : for the shewing, I say, of His righteousness at this present season : that he might himself be just, and the justifier of him that has faith in Jesus. This is Paul's gospel, that God, when all men had come under condemnation by the law, had manifested a new righteousness through faith in Jesus unto all them that believe. For the benefit of the Jews who composed the majority of the audience, he emphasises the fact that this righteousness had been witnessed unto by both the law and the prophets. There are therefore three distinct lines of proof for the truth of his thesis, the law, the prophets and their common experience in Christ Jesus. And appealing to that common Christian experience, he declares boldly, *We reckon therefore that a man is justified by faith apart from the works of law.**

This is the crux of the whole controversy and naturally leads on to the discussion of the part which faith and works played in the justification of Abraham. The relation of this passage to the epistle of James has been a matter of great dispute. Dr. Moffatt declares that beyond all reasonable doubt the Jacobean dissertation presupposes the Pauline propaganda. In direct opposition to this opinion, Zahn asserts that Paul, when writing his contribution to the discussion, had the statement of James in his mind that Abraham was justified by works. Mayor concludes that though Paul and James agree generally in

their conclusions, the former contradicts the remark of the other as liable to be misapplied. The late Principal Patrick contends that if Paul had the words of James in view, he would have mentioned him by name, and specified what he considered to be imperfect or wrong. "Surely," he says, "Paul was too brave and manly not to express his dissent from the views of James, had he really differed from him." "Was Paul so lacking in insight," he continues, "as not to perceive the substantial identity of view between James and himself, or was he so wanting in command of language as to be unable to make their identity plain, without as it were directly traversing the assertion of James?" Writing from the traditional point of view that Romans was originally addressed to the Church at Rome, it must be confessed that there is considerable force in Patrick's objection to the opinion of Mayor. But granting the hypothesis that the apostle was actually addressing the Council at Jerusalem, the objection does not stand. Paul is not attacking an opponent behind his back. James is one of his hearers. The words of James had been used by his adversaries in Galatia and Antioch to prove that his teaching was not in harmony with that of the twelve; and Paul, knowing that there was complete agreement between himself and the leader of the Jerusalem Church, is appealing to James to specify more clearly what he means by works, surely not the ceremonial observance of the Mosaic law. Paul chivalrously refrains from mentioning to the Council the approval which James had given to his opinions, in a private interview, at the time of the famine; but knowing the like spirit of him who earned for himself the title of "The Just," the apostle feels confident that his appeal will not be passed by in silence. And in this connexion the letter which James despatched to the churches in Syria and Cilicia is very illuminating. He informs these churches

that they had been unsettled by *words* on the part of unauthorised persons who had gone forth from Jerusalem. Three important aspects of the justification of Abraham are clearly pointed out to these Jews. First, according to their own Scriptures Abraham was justified by faith: second, the covenant had been made with him whilst he was yet uncircumcised: and third, the covenant had designated him as the father of many nations. By this appeal to the authority of their own Hebrew Scriptures, Paul sought to win from these Jews their assent to the free entrance of the Gentiles into the Church through simple faith in Jesus.

The next division in Paul's address deals with the justification of the believer in Christ. From now on to the end of the eighth chapter we have the marrow of the Pauline soteriology. This passage is the cream of the whole epistle and in any exhaustive treatise upon Romans it would have to be allotted the principal place. To understand fully the meaning of these chapters, a thorough psychological examination of the apostle's religious experience would be necessary. This however goes beyond the scope of this present inquiry. Our interest is not theological but historical. It is not ours to plumb the mystery of these mystic depths, but only from the viewpoint of the Council at Jerusalem to note the effect of light and shadow upon the surface of the cerulean blue. We have no present brief to expound the thought of St. Paul in these chapters, but merely to relate them up, if we can, with the historical situation unfolded in the fifteenth chapter of the Acts.

One factor in favour of our hypothesis is the consistency we obtain in the apostle's delineation of the character of the Almighty. To Paul, God is no stern, harsh creditor who had to be propitiated by the terrible sufferings of Jesus upon the Cross. From the Nazarene, the erstwhile

Pharisee had learned that filial trust which could look up with confidence into the face of the Eternal and say Abba, Father. The forensic turn, which the apostle gave to his doctrine of justification by faith, was accidental to his surroundings and not fundamental to his thought. In that Council of Jerusalem, he was addressing his fellow-countrymen with their legalistic conception of righteousness. Obligation and recompense were the key-words of their system. Through the keeping of the Mosaic law, man could find favour in the sight of God as his own legal right. Experience had however taught them how futile were all human attempts to fulfil the requirements of the law. The slightest infringement of their legal code brought them under the just condemnation of Jehovah. Consequently, according to their own Scriptures, they found themselves in the position of debtors and defaulters before the judgment bar of God. The reasoning of the apostle is an *argumentum ad hominem*. The fuller revelation of God in Christ Jesus had shed new light upon the divine character, and had revealed the Almighty in His true attitude of love and mercy to man. Far from having to be placated by the sacrifice of the Cross, God of His own free grace had set forth His Son Jesus as a mercy-seat, before which all true penitents might find pardon and forgiveness. Even while they were yet sinners, the Almighty had commended His love to man in the death of His beloved. That audience of Palestinian and Hellenistic Jews would readily understand that the meaning which Paul attached to *ἱλαστήριον* was that which it possessed in the Greek Old Testament. The work of God in Christ is contrasted with the result of Adam's transgression. If through one trespass *the judgment came* unto all men to condemnation; even so through one act of righteousness *the free gift came* unto all men to justification of life. Nowhere does the apostle suggest

that God had to be reconciled to man. In his earlier epistle to the Galatians, he had declared emphatically that the Covenant of promise made unto Abraham had not been disannulled by the promulgation of the law ; but at Jerusalem speaking to his own countrymen, he was under the necessity of adopting a more deferential attitude to the Mosaic code. He had to be careful of Jewish susceptibilities, and with all tenderness he is seeking to make known to the Jews before him that the true but partial disclosure of God's character from Mount Sinai must give place to the full and perfect revelation of His love in Christ Jesus our Lord.

At this point he turns aside to answer more fully the antinomian objection which had been raised to his teaching in a former session of the Council. With horror, he rejects this interpretation of his doctrine. *We who died to sin, how shall we any longer live therein? Or are ye ignorant that we who were baptized into Christ Jesus were baptized into his death? We were buried therefore with him through baptism into death : that like as Christ was raised from the dead through the glory of the Father, so we also might walk in newness of life.* The fact that these words were spoken to Jews in the city of Jerusalem disproves the relation of their thought to Greek mystery cults. Paul had no magical view of the sacrament of baptism. It was no *opus operatum*. Those sacramentarians are decidedly wrong in thinking that Paul taught that, at the moment of baptism, a mysterious change begins to take place in the believer without any co-operation or any exercise of will on his part. The apostle's thought of baptism is full of ethical content. It meant a break with the old life of sin and an identification of the will of the believer with that of Christ. The new life is no mysterious, effortless, transmutation of being, but an act of will, a conscious walk in fellowship with the Lord.

In superficial resemblance there is a true relationship between the outward life of faith and Jewish piety, with this distinction, that the one is ever the inspirational expression of the inward spirit, whilst the other might be a mere mechanical obedience to external law. The apostle emphasises the complete separation of the life of faith from sensual indulgence in sinful lust by a telling illustration which he draws from the slave market. In the past, when they had been the slaves of sin, they were free in regard to righteousness: but now having been made free from sin they had become servants unto God. The freedom of the life of faith from sin was no dream of the imagination, it was corroborated by the universal testimony of Christian experience. In the days when he had been a zealot for the law, he was so conscious of the presence of sin in his heart that he had despaired of deliverance from the body of this death. To Gentile Christians in Galatia, he had freely admitted the inferiority of the law, but in Jerusalem, in deference to Jewish opinion, he recognises that the law is holy, and the commandment holy, and righteous and good. With the tact and courtesy of a true gentleman, the apostle had refrained from uniting his audience with himself in that overwhelming sense of guilt, but with a diplomatic stroke of genius, he combines his hearers with himself in his experience of joy under grace and asks them to acknowledge the glad assurance of sins forgiven, which they had all found in Christ. *For I am persuaded, that neither death, nor life, nor angels, nor principalities, nor things present, nor things to come, nor powers, nor height, nor depth, nor any other creature, shall be able to separate us from the love of God, which is in Christ Jesus our Lord.*

The whole thought of these four chapters is distinctively Jewish. The apostle is seeking to link up the work of God in creation with the grand consummation of all things.

The whole emphasis is upon the great eternal purpose of God for man. The words *κατ' εἰκόνα θεοῦ*, which the Greek Old Testament employs to describe man as he came from the creative hand of God, would appear to be in his thought. His reference to Adam shows that he is thinking of these early chapters of Genesis. Man had fallen from his high estate and is restored, not by any effort of his own but by the free grace of God. The antinomian objection, that is raised, is one which would occur to a practical-minded Jew who had been drilled in the keeping of the Mosaic law. And the whole argument of the apostle tends to show the absurdity of crediting one like himself, who had been taught that man was made in the image of God, with such a lax notion of justification. The fore-ordained purpose of God is to restore man to the beauty and purity of his created state, to recreate him *συμμόρφους τῇς εἰκόνας τοῦ Υἱοῦ*. It was a fundamental axiom of current eschatological thought among his countrymen that "the End is to be as the Beginning." Against the background of that Jewish Council, the fulfilment of apocalyptic expectation in the restoration of man, not the Jew alone, to the state of his pristine glory was the most powerful plea St. Paul could have used to neutralise Jewish national and religious prejudices.

With chapter eight the apostle concludes his main argument, but one question which had been raised in the course of the debate still remains to be answered, the place of the Jew in the divine economy. To the solution of this problem the apostle devotes other three chapters. The fact that this difficulty is discussed at such length is in our opinion an unmistakable indication that Jerusalem was the place of the debate. Deissmann sees in this argument over the fate of Israel the tossing to and fro of a perturbed soul. Where more likely would the apostle reveal his heart anguish

over the rejection of his people and be overcome with emotion than in Jerusalem, the capital of his race, and before men, who, though avowedly followers of Jesus, were showing all the faults of Hebrew religious pride and exclusion? Can we wonder that, near that very spot where Jesus wept over the city, the soul of that follower, who discerned most clearly the import of His teaching, should writhe with agony over the racial inability of his people to understand the gospel of God's free grace? In the passion of his soul, he cries out vehemently, *I say the truth in Christ, I lie not, my conscience bearing witness with me in the Holy Ghost, that I have great sorrow and unceasing pain in my heart. For I could wish that I myself were anathema from Christ for my brethren's sake, my kinsmen according to the flesh.*

Even in the darkness of their sorrow, the apostle reminds his hearers that there is some glimmering of light and hope. There is surely some satisfaction in knowing that *they are Israelites, their's is the Sonship, the Glory, the covenants, the divine legislation, the Worship and the promises; the patriarchs are their's, and their's too (so far as natural descent goes) is the Christ who is over all.*¹ The ascription of deity to Christ in verse five of the Authorised Version will be to some a sufficient reason to discredit the giving of so early a date as that of the Council at Jerusalem to this portion of the epistle. But even if these critics be sound in their contention that deity was not ascribed unto Jesus until nearly two decades later, we feel no difficulty in following Moffatt in taking the words *θεός εὐλογητός εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας* as a detached doxology which breaks forth from the lips of Paul, although we differ from him in regarding the phrase *ὁ ὢν ἐπὶ πάντων* as qualitative of Christ and not of God. However far the apostle may have advanced in his Christological thinking at the time of the Council, he was

¹ Following closely Moffatt's translation.

not likely to endanger his case by ascribing to Jesus a title that was liable to be offensive to the Jews with their strong monotheistic conception of deity. But we can imagine the apostle saying that no matter how much they might grieve over the exclusion of Israel from the present blessedness, they could thank God that He had not deprived their nation of the glorious privilege of manifesting unto the world the Christ who is over all. Years afterwards the unpunctuated written words of the apostle were seen to contain another meaning which was in keeping with the Christological development, and this deeper conception was gladly accepted by the apostle himself as the true interpretation of his mind.

If the uncontrollable emotion manifested by the apostle in chapters nine to eleven can best be explained by the place of meeting and the presence of his own kinsmen after the flesh, the same hypothesis perfectly accounts for the line of argument that is followed. St. Paul is reasoning from premises the validity of which these Jews must admit, namely the absolute sovereignty of God as it is delineated in the Scriptures of the Old Testament. The apostle is dealing with the election of nations for specific duty in this world, and the question of eternal salvation and the lot of the individual do not enter into his present thought. The word of God cannot fail, therefore the reprobation of Israel cannot mean the defeat of the Almighty. They are not all Israel, which are of Israel. God is only acting now, as always, in the sovereignty of His elective grace. Mere physical heredity is of no account with God. He sets aside Ishmael in favour of Isaac. If that instance will not satisfy them in that the mother of the rejected was a slave and of the chosen, a free woman, the case of Esau and Jacob, the offspring of the same womb, must surely be conclusive. Whilst these two sons of Isaac were yet unborn, and before

they had had any opportunity of proving their worth, God had said, "The elder shall serve the younger"; and the subsequent history of the two peoples had only demonstrated that truth. "What shall we say then? Is there unrighteousness with God? God forbid." A Jew could only give a negative answer to this question of the apostle, "I will have mercy," said God, "on whom I will have mercy, and I will have compassion on whom I will have compassion." God dispenses His gifts to whom He will. The desire of man is impotent against the sovereign will of God.

The reference to the hardening of Pharaoh's heart raises an ethical difficulty. Paul quotes Old Testament authority to prove that the power of God over His creatures is as absolute as that of the potter over the clay. The apostle does not believe that God ever acts arbitrarily with men. He never implies that God has created man for the purpose of damnation. There have not been lacking theologians who have drawn such a logical conclusion from his premises, but these have failed to notice that in these chapters we have an example of special pleading before a definite tribunal. The apostle is not discussing meanwhile the principles on which God acts, he is only emphasising to his own people that their own Scriptures give them no ground for complaint. "Throughout," says Professor Findlay, "Paul asserts the challenged right of God to deal judicially with Israel; he is not denying man's freedom in order to safeguard God's sovereignty, but maintaining God's freedom against Jewish presumption."

Having drawn from the Old Testament the rather harsh delineation of God's absolute sovereignty over all His creatures, the apostle seeks to brighten up the picture by the declaration of God's free mercy and love. Though he does not intellectually dispute the rigidity of Old Testament doctrine, the genius of his religious spirit senses rather

than asserts that God's absolute sovereignty is limited by His own divine character. He finds a prediction of the ingathering of the Gentiles in the words of the prophet Hosea, and into Isaiah's doctrine of the remnant he reads the acceptance of salvation through Christ by part of his nation. The only possible conclusion is that the Gentiles have through faith attained unto righteousness, whilst the Jews, who sought after it, have through their law failed of their purpose. Truly, before their eyes, they had seen the fulfilment of prophecy, the stumbling of Israel over that rock laid in Mount Sion to trip them up. Passionately Paul reiterates that the great desire and constant prayer of his heart is that his brethren might be saved. He gives them full credit for their great zeal, but unfortunately it is not after knowledge. They had sought after their own righteousness, a righteousness unattainable except by the perfect keeping of the whole law. And they had refused to accept that righteousness of God, which is nigh unto them. Here the apostle, with great daring, is applying to the righteousness which is of faith words which were used of the law itself. He associates Christ, not with the dogmatic Messiah of the Jews who is fettered to his own native land, but with the divine λόγος. This was a great step forward, which universalised the religion of Jesus. That Jesus was the λόγος was no new discovery of the Johannine gospel. It is asserted here by Paul, not as a deduction from Greek philosophy, but as the inherent teaching of their own Mosaic law. The primitive preaching of the Church is declared to be in full harmony with the spirit of prophecy, and there was no possible room in this revelation of God's free love for any distinction between Jew and Gentile. It was indeed predicted that all of their nation would not believe the gospel, and this failure of the Jews to accept the full revelation of God must be attributed

partly to their own fault, for the message had gone forth unto all the earth, and partly to the fault of them who already believe. By their too rigorous adhesion to the customs of their fathers, to their law, and their historic temple they had screened the glory that excelleth, the good tidings of Him who had declared the time cometh and now is when the true worshipper shall worship the Father, neither in this mountain nor at Jerusalem, but in spirit and in truth. Let them therefore get busy and publish the glad tidings abroad, for beautiful are the feet of them that preach the gospel of peace.

However much they may grieve that more of their people had not accepted the Lord Jesus, the prospect is not wholly dark. There is still hope for their people. Did not Moses declare that God would provoke them to jealousy by them that are no people. And this very situation is being fulfilled before their very eyes. The Lord is being found by them who sought Him not, while all the time His hands are stretched forth unto His own disobedient children. It was impossible to believe that the Lord had forsaken His people for ever. Elijah had despaired of Israel long before, but God had assured him that He had still seven thousand who have not bowed the knee to the image of Baal. So too now Paul consoles them, there is a remnant according to the election of grace. The election has obtained salvation and the rest have been blinded. Turning to the few Gentiles that are present in the Council, and addressing through them the multitudes of their number who believe, the apostle implores them not to exult over the downfall of Israel, but rather provoke them to emulation, so that some may be saved.

Quoting from the Old Testament Scriptures where Israel is compared to the withered branches, broken off from the green olive tree, the apostle declares that the Gentiles are

shoots of a wild olive which had been grafted upon the parent stem in the place of the branches which had been removed. But let not the Gentiles exult over the branches which were broken off. Let them not be high-minded but fear : for if God can graft into a good olive tree the branches of a wild olive, how much more shall these, which are the natural branches, be grafted into their own olive tree !

Paul's hope and assurance is that somehow yet in the providence of God all Israel shall be saved. The promise of their Scriptures is that the Redeemer will come unto Sion. For their fathers' sake they are still beloved : the gifts and calling of God are without repentance. As he thinks of the wisdom and love of God, the apostle is made bold to declare that God hath shut up all unto disobedience, that He might have mercy upon all ; then fearing lest he has been too hasty in this daring speculation, he suddenly brings his address to a close with a doxology, *O the depths of the riches both of wisdom and knowledge of God ! how unsearchable are his judgments, and his ways past tracing out ? For who has known the mind of the Lord ? or who hath been his counsellor ? or who hath given to him, and it shall be recompensed unto him again ? For of him, and through him, and unto him, are all things. To him be the glory for ever. Amen.*

We have followed the progression of the argument of the apostle and we have found that it meets perfectly the situation which had developed at the time of the Council. Moreover if we compare the brief account which Luke gives of the speeches which were made by Peter and James at this time, we will notice that they have evidently the arguments of St. Paul in their minds. Curiously enough, Bacon thinks the words which Luke puts into the mouth of Peter a blemish upon the historicity of the writer. He imagines that the author of the Acts is seeking, from the

standpoint of after years, to establish the priority of Peter in the Church, a priority which we know from the letters of St. Paul the Galilean never possessed. But when we have grasped the true situation, we realise that far from making Peter the outstanding speaker before the Council, Luke has carefully preserved for us the fact that the Galilean contented himself in his remarks to do nothing more than emphasise the points already made by his more brilliant fellow-worker. From the fifteenth chapter of the Acts we get the impression that Peter spoke at an early session of the Council shortly after the opponents of St. Paul had interjected their objections to his argument, and from this, naturally, we would expect to find, in the speech of Peter, reference only to the opening remarks of St. Paul. And this is just exactly what we do find. *And God, which knoweth the heart,¹ bare them witness, giving them the Holy Ghost, even as he did unto us ; and he made no distinction between us and them,² cleansing their hearts by faith.³ Now therefore why tempt ye God, that ye should put a yoke upon the neck of the disciples, which neither our fathers nor we were able to bear ? ⁴ But we believe that we shall be saved through the grace of the Lord Jesus in like manner as they.⁵* The remarks of James, who waited to the end of the debate to sum up the whole argument, seem on the other hand to have a close relationship with the closing portion of Paul's address. The restoration of Israel and the ingathering of the Gentiles, which form the thought of chapters nine to eleven, are the two things which are emphasised by James in giving judgment. His decision is in favour of the entire freedom of the Gentiles from the observances of the Mosaic law. The only requirements demanded of the Gentiles are ethical, that they should abstain from things

¹ Rom. ii. 29.² Rom. iii. 22.³ Rom. iii. 21-23.⁴ Rom. ii. 1-25.⁵ Rom. i. 16, 17.

offered to idols, from blood (i.e., murder) and from fornication.

To the modern mind the reasoning of the apostle in these chapters may appear to be defective. His logic may be in places faulty. His use of the Old Testament is not in keeping with the canons of historical grammatical exegesis ; but judged by the standards and methods of his day, and viewed in its relationship to the Council at Jerusalem, his authoritative Rabbinical use of the Scriptures is brilliantly justified in the freedom it won for the Church. By his speech, he cut the painter which bound the early body of disciples to Judaism, and made possible the creation of the Church Catholic.

A. M. POPE.

JESUS AND BAPTISM.

IN the EXPOSITOR of May (1921), Dr. E. W. Winstanley raises once again the question whether Jesus baptized or not and whether or no He left a command to His disciples to do so. The point is one of great importance in helping us to decide, not only upon the question of the historical worth of the Gospels, but also upon the question of the validity of the sacrament. It does not by any means follow that baptism, adult baptism that is, should be discontinued, if it is desired by some, even if it cannot be traced to a direct command or practice of Jesus; but it cannot be doubted that the attitude of many people would be changed if it were established that Jesus neither baptized Himself nor gave a command to His disciples to baptize. But, putting that consideration aside, we must confess that the whole question requires the most dispassionate discussion.

Let us distinguish at the outset between the evidence for the command and that for the practice of Jesus. For the former, we have two pieces of evidence, namely, Matthew xxviii. 19, and Mark xvi. 16. Both of these verses have been veritable hot-beds of critical discussion. To take the command in Matthew first. We are prejudiced against it at the very first by the triune formula. For there would probably be very few scholars nowadays who would support Hort in saying that it is genuine. We need not here go into the argument fully, as it is well known. This isolated reference to baptism in the name of the Trinity is quite enough to condemn it at once. In other places in the New Testament, where baptism is mentioned, it is always "in the name of the Lord Jesus" or something equivalent (cf. Acts ii. 38; xix. 5; 1 Cor. i. 13; Rom. vi. 3). We have the same formula in Didaché 9, although the trinitarian

formula appears in chapter vii. F. C. Conybeare has tried to prove, judging from quotations in Eusebius, that the primitive form of the verse was, "Go ye, and make disciples of all nations in my name, teaching them to observe whatsoever I command you," but whether this be right or not, the trinitarian formula can hardly represent a genuine utterance of Jesus. This is another example of the ecclesiastical tendency of Matthew. But the very fact that he can quote the saying wrongly makes us chary in taking it at all as genuine. Did Jesus command His disciples to baptize in any name? If He did give such a command, it was a post-resurrection one. Now, we have four accounts of the parting words of Jesus. They are Matthew xxviii. 19-20; Mark xvi. 15-18; Luke xxiv. 44-49; and John xx. 21-3. John omits any reference to Jesus instituting baptism, but that does not mean very much. He also omits reference to the institution of the Eucharist. His importance in regard to both these sacraments lies in the fact that he interprets rites which are in practice, and sees no reason to relate their institution. For our present purpose he is not important either way. It makes no difference to him whether Jesus commanded baptism or not; it is enough that baptism and the Eucharist are the most suggestive methods at hand for interpreting the inner meaning of the Christian religion. Luke records nothing about the command to baptize, and he is more important, particularly when we remember the emphasis he gives to it in Acts. The concluding portion of Mark is not of much importance. It is evidently a catena of quotations taken from the other Gospels, and it has no independent value. Thus we are left with Matthew alone as evidence for the command. Acts also gives no evidence of the institution. We have another witness in the negative from Paul in 1 Corinthians i. 17. The fact that Paul realised that his

mission was to preach and not to baptize, particularly when we remember his care in preserving the institutions and teaching handed down, is quite enough to prove that the early Church was capable of distinguishing between a rite which was essential because it rested upon the command of Jesus, and one which was helpful and suggestive and perhaps even necessary as a witness to the world and as a sign of sincerity, and also as a symbol of the new life in Christ, but which did not come from Jesus. Paul would hardly have refrained from baptizing had he known of any definite command of Jesus, and he would hardly have been kept in ignorance of such a fact by the other apostles. Jesus cannot have given any general command for baptism, if we are to give any rational interpretation of 1 Corinthians i. 17. It is not at all suggested that the risen Jesus did not impart instructions or even totally new instructions to His disciples. Such a view could be held only by those who regard the post-resurrection appearances as merely subjective or visionary. But the very suspicion with which the Church regarded the Gentile mission is hard to explain if Jesus had given them a universal programme; it was the logic of facts which drove them to that. Thus, we have to acknowledge that Jesus did not command baptism. Can we go a step further and discuss whether He practised it?

We have two, and only two, positive pieces of evidence. The first is the Gospel of John, and the second is the practice of the early Church, which would be more intelligible if it were a continuation of that of Jesus. But against the latter must again be placed the attitude of Paul. 1 Corinthians i. 17 is virtually a denial that Jesus baptized. The practice would almost certainly have been regarded as an institution. Thus we are left with the Fourth Gospel alone. Here we have two references in iii. 22 and iv. 1. The latter is negatived in the next verse. Wellhausen,

(*Das Evangelium Johannis*, p. 10), is almost certainly right in regarding this as an interpolation. Even the mystical language of John, which people are so fond of speaking about, is not enough to explain how he can say one thing in one verse, and give a direct contradiction of it in the next. Besides, we have iii. 22 to explain as well. We can only say that iv. 2 comes from a corrector. Some interpolations are correct ones. Is this ?

But, besides the definite references to baptism, we have the symbolism of the sacrament appearing in several places in the Gospel. We cannot examine all these now, and, in fact, it would not be of immediate help if we did. The sacramental language of John is fundamental to the Gospel. Not that he is sacramental in the sense that he emphasises rites as rites. Nothing could be further removed from his whole spirit and outlook. It would be a denial of his philosophic attitude to spirit and letter. But he cannot have been entirely opposed to the sacraments, or else he would have chosen other figures of speech to express his thoughts. To John, the sacraments of the Eucharist and baptism summed up symbolically the whole meaning of Christianity as rebirth into and growth in the life of God. But that is by the way. Does his symbolism help us at all in deciding upon the practice of Jesus ? Dr. Winstanley quotes with approval Dr. Westcott's comment on iii. 22, "it was not and indeed could not be an anticipation of the Christian sacrament which it foreshadowed." So far as I can see, that is just what it was. But it was an anticipation in the mind of John, and not in the mind of Jesus. Against the complete silence of the Synoptists and the attitude of Paul, we must beware when we take up John. But when we remember his sacramental language, it ceases to be of any importance that he is historically inaccurate. By the time he wrote his gospel baptism was regarded not only as

necessary, but as efficacious, and it, like other things, was taken back into the life of Jesus to obtain sanction. Apart from the references to water and blood in the Gospel and the first Epistle of John, we have the symbolism of baptism showing itself in two scenes at least. The first is the discussion with Nicodemus, a scene obviously worked up, to judge by its schematic similarity with the story of the woman of Samaria and the discussion on the Bread of Life. Baptism to John symbolises rebirth, the passing out from the life of the world into the life of God. That is, in itself, almost sufficient justification for keeping the words *ῥδατος καί* in iii. 5. Of course, Nicodemus would not understand it. But he was never intended to understand. He is a mere figure; and the important thing is to make a Jewish Rabbi misunderstand a divine truth. Many scholars reject *ῥδατος καί* as a gloss, but there is no need to do this. But what does the baptism mean? Does it mean that of John the Baptist? Not a bit of it. Does it mean that practised by Jesus and His disciples? Not at all. It means Christian baptism, that is, baptism into Christ, and you could not have Christian baptism until Christ was dead and risen again. John's language is evidence of a practice in the Church, a practice which we know of elsewhere, but which John thought needed interpretation: it is no evidence of a practice of Jesus and of the disciples during the lifetime of Jesus.

The second reference I referred to was the story of the foot-washing in John xiii. It is quite possible (to my mind, quite probable) that Jesus did actually wash the feet of His disciples, although this is not related in any of the Synoptists. But the dialogue which takes place afterwards does not quite harmonise with what foot-washing would generally symbolise, i.e., humble, willing service. The dialogue does certainly show (taking the scene as historically correct)

that Jesus washed the feet of His disciples for one great purpose among others, namely, to give them an example of true greatness and real discipleship. But xiii. 9-10 does not fit this. Von Dobschütz (*Stud. und Kritik.*, 1905) would therefore omit xiii. 9. This reveals colossal lack of imagination. It is the being washed by Christ that is the important thing. Once baptized by and into Christ, and we are clean every whit. Afterwards there is need only for the dust to be washed off the feet, which comes by our journeying through life. But this again is an interpretation of a practice of the Church. It is no evidence that Jesus Himself baptized.

Now we have gone that far, we can go a little farther. Jesus did not command baptism. In all probability, He did not practise it. Where then did the early Church take its example from? We have no need to drag in extraneous influences. The disciples had the example of John the Baptist before them, and the respect with which he is always treated is evidence that his connexion with the Christian message was close. They had also the example of Jesus before them, who was baptized, even if He did not baptize. Whatever be the reason of His action in undergoing baptism (and the explanations of the evangelists show that it caused difficulty to the minds of people), it was a sacred memory to His disciples, and it marked a crisis in His life. On earth He exercised the power to forgive sins. The disciples could not do that. But they needed something to differentiate the saved from the unsaved. What more natural than that they should submit to baptism as Jesus did, in order to signify their devotion to the Kingdom of God?

H. J. FLOWERS.

UNUSUAL MEANINGS FOR PREPOSITIONS
IN THE GREEK NEW TESTAMENT.

GREEK prepositions are like Greek conjunctions in that they are capable of having so many meanings, depending upon the contexts in which they are used. These parts of speech have some basic, fixed meanings which apply to them in the main, but their exceptional meanings are more numerous, as an inductive study will reveal, than many are aware of. Prepositions are borrowed adverbs which were pressed into use to help express the case ideas with more definiteness and exactness. And fortunately they are very numerous in the New Testament. An interesting thing about a Greek preposition is that it may express several either kindred or diverse ideas. Because of this fact it is at times exceedingly difficult to determine what force it may have in a given passage. Variety may be the spice of life, but it tends to cause confusion when it applies to the meaning of a word.

Because the variations in the uses of prepositions are so frequent, my interest was aroused to the extent that I made a thorough, inductive study of them in the New Testament. After this was done, the translations I had determined upon were compared with those given in Liddell and Scott, Gessner Harrison's *Greek Prepositions and Cases*, Thayer, etc. The confirmation from these authorities for my conclusions was even greater than I had expected. This article deals only with rare and exceptional uses of prepositions, such as are barely mentioned, if at all, in the lexicons by Thayer and Abbott-Smith.

Let us first notice some unusual meanings for ἀπό. In James i. 13 we read, "Let no man say when he is tempted, I am tempted ἀπό θεοῦ"; and in Acts xv. 4 we have, "And

when they were come to Jerusalem, they were received ἀπὸ τῆς ἐκκλησίας." Both contexts imply that ἀπό expresses agency and that it is equivalent to our word *by*. Then in Acts xxviii. 3 we have the account of how Paul was stung by a viper which came out of the fire (ἀπὸ τῆς θερμῆς), which the R.V. rightly translates "by reason of the heat." We have a parallel to this strange causal use of ἀπό in P. Fay. cxi. 4, "I blame you greatly for having lost two little pigs ἀπὸ τοῦ σκυλμοῦ τῆς ὁδοῦ—on account of the fatigue of the journey." Liddell and Scott cite this meaning, quoting from Herodotus.

Διὰ is also used a few times to express agency in the New Testament. Liddell and Scott give such a meaning for it, and it is so used frequently in the papyri. On pages 39 and 40 in G. Milligan's *Greek Papyri* are four places where it means *by*. The writer says he sends two letters διὰ Νηδύμον μίαν, διὰ Κρονίου . . . μίαν; and he states that an enclosed document is to be signed διὰ Διοδώρου . . . ἢ διὰ τῆς γυναικός. In Matthew xiii. 35 we have, "that which was spoken *by* the prophet," and in 1 Corinthians xi. 12, 2 Corinthians i. 19 and 1 Peter ii. 14, the R.V. has rightly translated it *by*. Our word *through*, which is the regular translation for διὰ when used with the ablative case, may also express agency, so there is little occasion to insist on the word *by*, even though agency is implied.

Another interesting shade of meaning for this word, which Liddell and Scott, and Thayer have given is *for the sake of*. And it is so translated in Matthew xix. 12; Romans xi. 28; 1 Corinthians iv. 6; 2 Corinthians iv. 11, 15.

For ἐν in the sense of *on* as it is translated in Matthew xx. 21, 23, "*on* thy right hand and *on* thy left," we have ample confirmation in the papyri. In P. Rylands, vol. ii. 160. 6, we read "a scar *on* the right forearm," and in P. Fayum 91. 10, "a scar *on* the right shin." Professor G.

Milligan gives this translation in his *Vocabulary of the Greek Testament*.

But the preposition with the most interesting variations in its uses is *εἰς*. Historically it was derived from *ἐν*, and by the first century it had assumed many of its functions. Somewhere between then and now it completely supplanted *ἐν*, for *ἐν* is not found in modern Greek. It is used in so many senses in the New Testament that one must depend largely upon the context to be sure of what it means. Besides its regular meanings, *into*, *unto*, *to*, and *for* it also means *in*, *against*, *among*, etc. It seems to have such meanings as *in respect to*, *with reference to*, *in regard to* a few times in the New Testament. Professor Milligan in *Greek Papyri*, page 36, translates it *with reference to* in a document dated A.D. 22. And this was a recognised classical usage according to Liddell and Scott. A few examples in the New Testament are: Romans x. 4, "For Christ is the end (or fulfilment) of the law *with respect to* righteousness to every one that believeth"; Romans xv. 2, "Let each one of you please his neighbour *with respect to* the good towards edification"; Ephesians v. 32, "This mystery is great, but I speak *with reference to* Christ and the Church." Cf. Thayer and Abbott-Smith in their lexicons.

Another strange translation is that of *as*, which is self-evident in Mark x. 8, "And the two shall be *as* one flesh"; in Acts vii. 53, "Who received the law *as* commandments of angels"; Romans iv. 3, 9, "And it was reckoned to him *as* righteousness . . . to Abraham his faith was reckoned *as* righteousness." Cf. also Acts xiii. 22. So Liddell and Scott.

Liddell and Scott give examples of *εἰς* being used to express purpose. So also do Goodwin in his *Greek Grammar*, and Thayer and Abbott-Smith in their lexicons. In P. Rylands, vol. ii. 138. 25, A.D. 34, it is used in this sense.

A man states that he was keeping two hundred silver drachmæ εἰς ἀγορασμὸν πραγμάτων—for the purpose of a purchase of goods. And in the same volume, 171. 15, A.D. 56, in the accompanying translation, it is translated *for the purpose of*; and in the documents 168 and 169, *ibid.*, εἰς σποράν is translated *to be sown*, which implies purpose. Following are a few examples of this use in the New Testament: Matthew viii. 34, “And behold all the city went out *for the purpose of* meeting Jesus”; Romans vi. 19, “So now present your members as servants to righteousness *for the purpose of* sanctification”; 2 Corinthians ii. 12, “Now when I came to Troas *for the sake of* the gospel of Christ”; Ephesians iii. 2, “Which was given me *for your sake*”; iv. 15, “That we may increase in all things *for his sake*”; vi. 22, “Whom I have sent unto you *for this very purpose*” R.V.; cf. also John xiii. 29; Acts xxviii. 15; Philippians i. 11; Colossians i. 10, 11, 12. When one considers in Acts ii. 38 repentance as self-renunciation and baptism as a public expression of self-dedication and self-surrender to Christ, which it certainly implied in the first century, the expression εἰς ἄφεσιν τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν ὑμῶν may mean *for the purpose of the remission of sins*. But if one stresses baptism, without its early Christian import, as a ceremonial means of salvation, he does violence to Christianity as a whole, for one of its striking distinctions from Judaism and Paganism is that it is a religion of salvation by faith while all others teach salvation by works.

For the possibility of εἰς having casual significance in the New Testament there is no Greek authority that I am aware of whom I may quote. And I do not have any inductive evidence to offer from Greek literature apart from the New Testament. However, the evidence in it favouring a causal usage, if one follows the inductive method, is quite convincing. In the *Vocabulary of the*

Greek Testament is this statement: "Professor H. A. A. Kennedy has collected a number of instances of this use of $\epsilon\nu$ = 'because of,' on account of 'from the LXX. and from the Pauline Epistles."

Since $\epsilon\iota\varsigma$ is derived from $\epsilon\nu$ or $\epsilon\nu\varsigma$ and gradually took over its meanings, may it not also have been used in this sense? At any rate the following examples of its uses are at least circumstantial evidence for a causal meaning: Matthew xii. 31— $\epsilon\iota\varsigma$ τί ἐδόκτασας, which the R.V. renders "wherefore didst thou doubt?" Literally, "on account of what didst thou doubt?" Compare this with Mark ii. 18, "Διὰ τί οἱ μαθηταὶ Ἰωάννου καὶ οἱ μαθηταὶ τῶν Φαρισαίων νηστεύουσιν—on account of what, or why, do the disciples of John and of the Pharisees fast?" $\epsilon\iota\varsigma$ and $\delta\iota\alpha$ are used as if they were interchangeable synonyms in these two examples. Romans iv. 20 has an interesting use of this preposition—"And without being weakened in faith he considered his own body now as good as dead (he being about a hundred years old), and the deadness of Sarah's womb; $\epsilon\iota\varsigma$ δὲ τὴν ἐπαγγελίαν τοῦ θεοῦ οὐ διεκράθη τῇ ἀπιστίᾳ ἀλλὰ ἐνεδυναμώθη τῇ πίστει but *because of* the promise of God he did not waver through unbelief but waxed strong through faith." The context clearly implies that it was the promise of God that strengthened and confirmed Abraham in the belief that Sarah would give birth to a son. The R.V. has paraphrased $\epsilon\iota\varsigma$ in this sentence by the words *looking unto*! Titus iii. 14 may be translated smoothly and effectively by treating $\epsilon\iota\varsigma$ as causal—"and let our people learn to maintain good works *because of* the compelling needs, in order that they may not be unfruitful." When so translated it becomes a fitting climax to the epistle's urgent plea for aggressive, winsome Christian character. The sentence $\mu\epsilon\tau\epsilon\nu\acute{o}\eta\sigma\alpha\nu \epsilon\iota\varsigma \tau\acute{o} \chi\acute{\eta}\rho\nu\gamma\mu\alpha \text{ } \text{Ἰωνᾶ}$ in Matthew xii. 41 and Luke xii. 32 is forceful evidence for a causal use

of this preposition. What led to their repentance? Of course it was Jonah's preaching. Matthew iii. 11 furnishes further evidence—*ἐγὼ μὲν ὑμᾶς βαπτίζω ἐν ὕδατι εἰς μετάνοιαν*. Did John baptize that they might repent or because of repentance? If the former, we have no further Scriptural confirmation of it. If the latter, his practice was confirmed and followed by the apostles, and is in full harmony with Christ's demand for inward, genuine righteousness. In connection with this verse we have the testimony of a first century writer to the effect that John the Baptist baptized people only after they had repented. Josephus, *Antiquities of the Jews*, book 18, chapter 5, section 2, "Who (John) was a good man, and commanded the Jews to exercise virtue, both as to righteousness towards one another and piety towards God, and so to come to baptism; for that the washing (with water) would be acceptable to him, if they made use of it, not in order to the putting away of some sins, but for the purification of the body; supposing still that the soul was thoroughly purified beforehand by righteousness." Cf. Mark xv. 34; Romans xi. 32; Hebrews xii. 7.

Ἐπί is another preposition which has numerous meanings. Liddell and Scott and Thayer and others, along with its regular meanings, give also such as the following for it: *in*, Romans i. 10; vi. 21; viii. 20; *against*, Luke xiv. 31; Acts xiii. 50; Romans i. 18; *for*, Matthew iii. 7; Acts xix. 10, 34; xx. 13; *after*, Luke i. 59; xiv. 34; Romans v. 14; *on account of*, Luke i. 47; Acts xxvi. 6; Romans v. 12; *in the time of*, Mark ii. 26; Luke iii. 2; iv. 27; Acts xi. 28. The above references are sufficient proof for such translations.

Regarding *κατά* Thayer follows Liddell and Scott in giving it such translations as, *with reference to*, *with regard to*, *as to*, *pertaining to*, etc. Compare Romans xiv. 22;

1 Corinthians xv. 15; 2 Corinthians vii. 11; Philippians iv. 11; Ephesians vi. 21.

Judging from the use of *κατά* in some sentences in the New Testament, there is some likelihood that it may be used to express means. Acts xix. 20, "*Οὕτως κατὰ κράτος τοῦ κυρίου ὁ λόγος ἤξανε καὶ ἰσχυεν*." Thus by means of the Lord's power the word increased and waxed strong." Ephesians iv. 22, "The old man that waxeth corrupt *by means of* the lusts of deceit." Compare also Ephesians iii. 3, 7, 20; iv. 16.

Two generally recognised unusual meanings for *παρά* are, first, *contrary to*, Acts xviii. 13, "This man persuades men to worship God *contrary to* the law"; Romans i. 26, "changed the natural use into that which is *contrary to* nature", Romans xi. 24, "grafted *contrary to* nature into a good olive tree"; second, *on account of*, 1 Corinthians xii. 15, 16—"It is not *on account of* this not of the body." Thayer and Abbott-Smith give both of these.

Πρό deviates only once in the New Testament from its regular meaning *before*. In my study of John x. 8, "*Πάντες ὅσοι ἦλθον πρὸ ἐμοῦ κλέπται εἰσὶν καὶ λησταί*," where it is translated *before*, the context led me to conclude it here meant the equivalent of *in the room of* or *claiming to be*. Some time after in reading Gessner Harrison's *Greek Prepositions and Cases*, page 408, I found quoted examples of such a use. He there says, "Whence comes the idea of occupying the place of another, or becoming his substitute." Such a translation for *πρό* in John x. 8 avoids the harshness now apparent in current translations. Liddell and Scott give a translation which is akin to the above, *instead of*. And Goodwin gives *in behalf of*.

Πρός has four strange uses (which Liddell and Scott give) that I shall merely indicate. In the sense of *with regard to*, *pertaining to*, Luke xix. 42—"things which pertain to peace,"

Romans xv. 17—“things pertaining to God”; 2 Peter i. 3—“all things that pertain to life.” In the sense of *with*, Matthew xxvi. 18—“*with* my disciples”; Luke ix. 41—“how long shall I be *with* you?” Romans v. 1—“we have peace *with* God”; Hebrews iv. 13—“*with* whom we have to do.” A few times with the accusative case it has the significance of *for*; John v. 35—“for a season in his light”; Acts xviii. 10—“things *for* their needs”; Titus i. 16—“unfit *for* every good work”; 2 Timothy iii. 17—“equipped *for* every good work.” The fourth strange usage may be expressed by *by means of*. In Ephesians iii. 4, “*by means of which* when we read”; iv. 14, “carried about with every wind of doctrine, *by means of* deceitful devices.”

Σύν has the translation *besides* in Luke xxiv. 21 in the R.V. It may also be translated the same way in Acts xvii. 34—“Damaris and others *besides* them.” Both Thayer and Abbott-Smith give this translation.

J. R. MANTEY.

THE SIGN OF JONAH.

CANON WINTERBOTHAM'S thoughtful and thought-provoking article in the January number of the EXPOSITOR raises some interesting questions. His object is to show how Jonah became a “sign” to the Ninevites. He clears the ground by dismissing what is probably a common understanding, that the “sign” consisted in the prophet's being swallowed by a “great fish” and disgorged alive after three days and three nights. He postpones consideration of St. Matthew xii. 40, which seems to confirm this understanding. He pauses a moment to assure us that if Jonah had told the people of Nineveh about his adventure with “the whale” they would only have laughed at him as a madman. “Very

naturally too ; we should have done the same." In any case the whale episode, "whatever it was, belonged to Jonah's own religious history : it had nothing to do with the Ninevites."

Was the Assyrian mind as inhospitable to marvel-tales as this seems to assume ? Orientals have always been fascinated by what is wonderful. To men who accepted the legends connected with their own deities the episode of the whale might not appear incredible. They would certainly not laugh at it. Recent exhibitions of credulity among ourselves, by no means confined to ignorant and uncultured people, should make us very cautious in attempting to define its limits. Taking the story as it stands, whether it be history or parable, whatever the experience meant for the prophet himself it is certain that the words of a man with such a strange record, who had been so signally delivered from the jaws of death, would be heard with vivid interest. It was precisely the kind of "sign" to arrest the attention and impress the mind of an Oriental people. With them it would go far to authenticate his message. We cannot "be satisfied . . . that the Ninevites never heard of it."

We come now to the Canon's own suggestion. He gives a true enough account of the Assyrians, of their character and methods. Courage and discipline made them formidable foes ; but their cruelty was horrible. Woe betide the land overrun by their soldiery. Peoples dreaded their approach as the Armenians or East Syrians that of Turk or Kurd to-day. Suppose then—the Canon thinks it quite probable—that the Assyrians have fallen upon the village of Gath-hepher in Galilee to which Jonah belongs, during one of his absences from home. When he returns he finds his boyhood's home a heap of blackened ruins, father and mother slaughtered, brothers, who had showed fight, tortured to death, sisters outraged and flung aside to die of

misery, shame and hunger. With all this fresh in his mind, moved by a resistless sense of divine urgency, "he arose and went to Nineveh." All the way he tramps through Assyrian territory. The good-natured people, knowing him for a Hebrew of Galilee, who, with his home and kindred, has been served so ill by their troops, view him with amazement, but feed and shelter him and pass him on with favourable messages. They hope that the inhabitants of Nineveh may listen to the warning he brings and repent, when surely his God will spare them. The message in form was one of doom. "Yet forty days and Nineveh shall be overthrown"; but behind it there was an assurance of love and mercy for penitents. "They saw only the poor, ragged Hebrew prophet in their midst, and supposed (naturally enough) that there was the same love, the same forgiveness, in his heart as in his mission and message." The Canon says in effect that Jonah, in spite of his sufferings at their hands, moved, as they suppose, by love for them, taking all risks to proclaim to them a message which is in essence a warning to repent, and an assurance of forgiveness, is a "sign" of that God who, outraged by their sins, yet waits to be gracious to such as repent and turn to Him. And this it was that so moved the Ninevites that they all repented after their fashion. We need not trace the parallel between Jonah so represented as a sign to the Ninevites and the Son of Man as a sign to his own generation. The difficulties in the way of the Canon's suggestion are serious.

Israel first came into collision with the Assyrians at Qarqar on the Orontes in 854 B.C., when Ahab, in alliance with Benhadad II. of Damascus and others, was defeated by Shalmaneser II., if we are to believe that monarch. The Assyrian retired beyond the Euphrates. If victory was his it must have been of the Pyrrhic order. Eleven years later (843 B.C.) he marched southward, defeated the Syrians on

Mount Hermon, but did not capture Damascus. Jehu of Israel saw his peril and prudently sent tribute to the conqueror, "silver, gold, golden bowls, royal sceptre and spear shafts (?) " thus preserving his country from invasion. An expedition against Damascus in 839 B.C. also failed, and after the Assyrian retreat Hazael reduced Israel to vassalage. Adadnirari III. made expeditions into Syria (806-803 B.C. and 797 B.C.), when Benhadad III. (?) of Damascus was compelled to submit and pay tribute. There is nothing to show that at this time the Assyrians entered Palestine. it is possible, indeed, that Adadnirari is referred to as "saviour" in 2 Kings xiii. 5. He had broken the power of Damascus, which, therefore, could no longer hold Israel in servitude. In these circumstances tribute would be paid right gladly to the Assyrian king.

With the passing of Adadnirari Assyria fell upon a period of decline. His immediate successors did not trouble the South Syrian states; and not till the reign of Tiglath-pileser III. did the Assyrian peril again approach the borders of Israel. By payment of tribute Menahem warded off invasion for a time. Threatened at once by Israel, Damascus, Edom, and the chiefs of Philistia (2 Kings xvi. 5, Isa. vii. 1 f., 2 Chron. xxviii. 17 f.), Ahaz of Judah, in despair, appealed to the Assyrian king for succour. In response Tiglath-pileser made war upon these states (734-732 B.C.), and then, as far as is known, the feet of the Assyrians for the first time trod the land of Israel. Now, the long and prosperous reign of Jeroboam II. would have been impossible had the monarchs on the Tigris maintained their vigour. It fell in its entirety within the period of Assyrian decline. This is the time to which the activity of Jonah is assigned; and it is the only one in which such a mission as his to Nineveh had any chance of success, or, indeed, humanly speaking, was possible at all. Triumphant Assyria, glorying in the victories of her deities,

was little likely to regard warning from a god unable to protect his own people from their prowess. The prophet of a subject nation then approaching them with Jonah's message would have had short shrift.

From all this it is clear that there were no Assyrian raids into Galilee during the prophet's lifetime. The home of his boyhood, therefore, and the dear ones of his family never suffered the calamities so movingly portrayed in the article. The supposition on which the theory is based, and which the Canon thinks "no improbable supposition, but quite the contrary," is not only improbable, but impossible.

Let it be remembered that the fortunes of Assyria were at a low ebb. The inhabitants of Nineveh were doubtless depressed and dispirited, fearing what might any day befall them at the hands of powerful and bitter foes, eager to profit by Assyrian weakness. While their hearts are full of foreboding there booms through the wide spaces of their vast city the voice of a prophet of doom. He is a weird dishevelled man, with the marks of some awful experience plain upon him. He is a Hebrew. How dares he to enter Nineveh? He will explain. He comes not of his own free-will. The first commission of his God he refused and attempted to escape. Can you not see their quivering interest as he tells of his flight to Joppa, the ship, the storm, the kindly sailors, the plunge into the waters, the engulfing by the great fish, and his return to dry land with a resistless sense of divine urgency, in obedience to which he has come to deliver his message? The story is told. The voice booms out again its heavy tidings. "Yet forty days and Nineveh shall be overthrown." What impressiveness it derives from the tale. It works upon their fears which darken into terror. There is no love in Jonah's heart: and be sure his manner will not suggest it. There is no sign of love or promise of pardon in the message. It is simply a

proclamation of doom which chimes all too well in harmony with their own dread. Dismay and alarm are the parents of their penitence, driving them to a wild, half-despairing cry to God for mercy. "Who can tell," they say, "if God will turn and repent . . . that we perish not?" It is surely not difficult to see the part played by the episode of "the whale" in constituting Jonah a "sign" to the Ninevites.

We proceed now to consider Matthew xii. 40, where our Lord is reported as saying, "For as Jonah was three days and three nights in the belly of the whale, so shall the Son of Man be three days and three nights in the heart of the earth." If this were correct it would be conclusive. "But," says the Canon, "there are certain things to be considered. First, *it is not true* that our Lord was 'three days and three nights' in the sepulchre. This is proved by the universal tradition and belief of Christendom, enshrined in our creeds and hymns . . . to the effect that He was crucified on a Friday, buried the same evening, and rose again early on the Sunday." It is well here to observe the emphasis laid on "the universal tradition and belief of Christendom": we shall have occasion to refer to it again. Meantime we note that it has not "behind it the express assertion of John (xix. 31, 42 : xx. 1, 19)," as the Canon claims. In the light of the debate as to the meaning of "the preparation of the passover" (John xix. 14), and "the Jews' preparation" (xix. 42 : cf. Matt. xxvii. 62), the statement is at least somewhat rash. The day on which the passover was eaten was itself a Sabbath, and "an high day," with a "preparation" of its own on which the lambs were slain. The Canon admits that there are traces of a tradition that allowed of a longer interval (St. Mark viii. 31 : ix. 31 : x. 34 ; St. Matt. xxvii. 63). If the 15th of Abib fell that year on a Friday, then the business of arrest, trial, and execution could not be carried

out that day without serious infraction of the law. Westcott's suggestion cannot be entirely ignored (*Introduction to the Study of the Gospels*, 4th edn., p. 339, "On the Day of the Crucifixion"). Chronological difficulties are sufficient to make dogmatism dangerous (see *Encyclopædia Biblica*, art. "Chronology," pars. 50 ff.). The possibility, therefore, that Jesus was crucified on Thursday, the 14th, cannot be definitely excluded. If that were so then Jesus lay in the tomb during the full period indicated in Matthew xii. 40.

But if the 14th were Friday, we may still believe that Jesus spoke the words attributed to Him in Matthew xii. 40, and also that He was not mistaken in His expectation. We have here to do with Jewish methods of reckoning. In the first place we may note that "after three days," and "on the third day" are used as equivalents, e.g. in 1 Kings xii. 5, 12. In the second place, the Canon says, "it is not allowable to affirm that the Jewish use of time expressions was so vague and inaccurate as to be practically unreliable. 'Three days and three nights' cannot anyhow be considered an equivalent of *one* day with two little bits of days added on, and two nights." If Jesus spoke these words, then, the Canon thinks, either "He was crucified on a Thursday"—a conclusion ruled out by universal tradition—"or He expected to remain buried for three days and three nights, and was mistaken." Only the latter alternative remains. Now, the question here is not whether or not we approve of the Jewish method of reckoning, but simply what that method was. Lightfoot's accuracy in quoting from the Talmud is not challenged (*Exercit. on St. Matthew*). The rabbis did not all think alike, but according to tradition one reputable interpreter, Rabbi Eliezer Ben Azariah, said, "A day and a night make one *'ōnah*, and a part of an *'ōnah* is as the whole." Rabbi Ismael also computed part of an *'ōnah* for the whole. Three *'ōnōth* were thus equivalent to

three days and three nights. But one entire day and night, with parts of the other two, were equivalent to three *ōnoth*. Christ's words would cause no difficulty to the Jewish mind : they need raise none in ours. According to their reckoning he *was* " three days and three nights " in the grave, even if he were buried on Friday and rose on Sunday morning. We are shut up to no such hard conclusion as that Jesus was mistaken. The Talmud is of course later than Jesus ; but it records earlier traditions, and reflects truly enough the practice of his time.

But Canon Winterbotham thinks that Matthew xii. 40 may be got rid of in another way. The rough frescoes in the catacombs at Rome show how greatly impressed the " singularly unintelligent, uncritical and ill-educated " Christians of the first and second centuries were " with the escape of Jonah from the belly of the whale as an illustration, or type of our Lord's resurrection." They were sure that Jonah's story " was miraculously foreordained to show forth the death, burial, and resurrection of our Lord." So a marginal note to the same effect as Matthew xii. 40 crept into one of the earliest copies of the completed Gospel. Then, as to the Gospel itself, " It is a commonplace of New Testament criticism " that Matthew collected the " discourses " there written, but that the *narrative* portions, largely borrowed from St. Mark, in which xii. 40 occurs, were added by a redactor " of little intelligence or education," some Christian Jew, perhaps, in the mountain country beyond Jordan during the last siege of Jerusalem.

It is important to note that according to " the universal tradition and belief of Christendom " the first Gospel as we possess it was from the hand of Matthew. Upon " the universal tradition and belief of Christendom," as we have seen, the Canon rests his assurance that Jesus was crucified on a Friday. Why is the same evidence rejected when it

proves that Matthew wrote the first Gospel? Further, it should be observed that the verse, chapter xii. 40, is found in every known copy of the Gospel. Suppose, then, that this Gospel was well known to the Roman Christians — more familiar, probably, than the book of Jonah. Only in Matthew is this saying of our Lord recorded. Justin Martyr tells of the common practice of Christians in those early days: — “On the day called Sunday all who live in the cities or in the country gather together in one place and the memorabilia of the Apostles, and the writings of the Prophets are read as long as time permits.” (*First Apology*, lxvii.) The frequent reading of this verse would quite naturally suggest the making of the frescoes. The Canon’s theory is needlessly cumbrous and far-fetched. The majority of these Christians may have been poor and ignorant: but the community numbered not a few persons in high positions, of wealth and education, and allowance must be made for their influence.

We cannot admit the Canon’s “commonplace of New Testament criticism” with such scholars against him as Lightfoot, Westcott, Theodore Zahn, and, to an important extent, Dr. James Moffatt. He really assumes the conclusion of a debate that is still in process. The controversy begins over the statement of Papias that “Matthew composed the oracles in the Hebrew language: and each one interpreted them as he could” (Eusebius, *H.E.* iii. 39). The Canon takes it that *λόγια*, here rendered “oracles,” means “discourses.” As to this so learned a scholar as Westcott says, “I am not aware that *λόγια* can be used in the sense of *λόγοι*, ‘discourses.’” (*The Canon of the New Testament*, 7th edn., p. 74.) Can it be shown that *λόγια* is ever so used? There is no agreement here. That these “discourses” existed independently, and were afterwards combined with *narrative* by an ignorant and unintelligent redactor, is so far

from being a "commonplace of New Testament criticism" that most will agree with Dr. James Moffatt when he writes, "These sayings of course must often have included a piece of narrative. Many of the Lord's most striking words were associated with some event or incident. When they were plucked up from the soil of the *ἁγραφὸς μνήμη* in the primitive tradition they would come up with some historical details of time and place clinging to them, like earth to the roots of a plant." He goes on to say that "a fair exegesis of the Papias-traditions forbids us to infer that any sharp distinction was drawn between the Marcan Gospel and the writing of Matthew" (*Introduction to the Literature of the New Testament*, p. 189). Westcott says that "the evidence carries us back to a time when no Greek Gospel of St. Matthew was generally current, though a Hebrew Gospel, for *λόγια*, *Oracles*, can mean no less, of which he was the author, was known and used" (*Introduction to the Study of the Gospels*, 4th edn., p. 183). With this Lightfoot agrees (*Essays on Supernat. Relig.*, pp. 167 ff.). Sanday and Headlam (*Romans*, I.C.C. p. 71) say that "from the time of Philo onwards the word [*λόγια*] was used of any sacred writing, whether discourse or narrative; so that it is a disputed point whether the *λόγια τοῦ κυρίου*, which Papias ascribes to Matthew, as well as his own *λογίων συγγραμμάτων ἐξηγήσεις*, were or were not limited to discourse." According to the text of Routh, Gebhardt and Harnack, and Funk, Papias applies the same term *λόγια* to the writing of Matthew and to the Gospel of Mark. It is not unreasonable to conclude that *λόγια* was an early name for the Gospel as read in the Christian Synagogue *pari passu* with the Prophetic Writings (Justin Martyr, *loc. cit.*).

[Note.—Two interesting facts may be mentioned here. (1) Doctors Moulton and Milligan in the course of their learned labours on the Papyri have not once met with the word

λόγια. (2) "The Sayings" of our Lord deciphered and published by Messrs. Grenfell and Hunt are entitled by them λόγια in the second part which was first issued: but in the first part, which appeared later, the original writer had called them λόγοι.]

When the presence of *narrative* with the *discourses* in the λόγια is not only admitted but seen to be inevitable, such a saying as that in Matthew xii. 40, with the circumstances of its utterance, found, as is acknowledged, in every known copy of the Gospel, cannot lightly be disturbed.

The evidence cited by Canon Winterbotham will not carry the conclusion that in Matthew we have the work, either as compiler or redactor, of an unintelligent and uneducated person. (1) In Matthew ii. 23, "That it might be fulfilled which was spoken by the prophets. He shall be called a Nazarene," no prophet is named. The document quoted from—if, indeed, it were not traditional matter—has not survived. But the association of the Messiah with a Branch (נִצְחָ, *nātzar*) was not unfamiliar to the prophetic mind (Isa. xi. 1, cf. Jer. xxxiii. 15, Zech. vi. 12, etc.). There may have been some play upon the word.¹ (2) In Matthew xxiii. 35 the murder of Zacharias was apparently the deed of the men addressed: "whom ye slew," our

¹ Similar plays upon words are well known: e.g., Jeremiah i. 11, "I see a rod of an almond tree" (רֹדֶף, *shāqēd*). "Thou hast well seen: for I will hasten (שָׁחַד, *shāḥad*) my word to perform it." And Amos viii. 1, "Amos, what seest thou? And I said, A basket of summer fruit (קָיִץ, *qāyit*). Then the Lord said unto me, The end (קֵץ, *hā qēt*) is come upon my people Israel."

A modern instance in the cognate Arabic was given me some years ago by an Arab gentleman. A friend of his had been in deadly peril from enemies who kept their purpose secret. My informant discovered the plot: but was at a loss how to convey warning to his friend, without arousing suspicion. Finally he sent him a basket containing a quince (مفرجل, *safarjal*). The recipient was puzzled at first, but thought rapidly *safar*, "travel," *'ajal*, "haste": so he read it; *safar 'jal*, "fly in haste"; and forthwith made good his escape.

Lord says, not "whom your fathers slew." Josephus we may be sure did not record all the crimes committed in those days. He does speak of a certain Zecharias, son of Baruch, as murdered by the Jews in the middle of the Temple during the siege of Jerusalem: but the man who could make a mistake of a century in writing his history, and could confuse Xerxes with his son Artaxerxes, was quite capable of transplanting an incident from, say A.D. 30 to A.D. 70. The victim may have been the father of John the Baptist. If it is maintained that "ye" includes the "fathers" then one thinks of Zechariah son of Jehoiada, who was killed in the temple court (2 Chron. xxiv. 20 f.). Jehoiada may have been his grandfather. Only from 2 Kings ix. 2 do we know that Jehu's father was Jehoshaphat. He is usually called the son of Nimshi, his grandfather. (3) In Matthew xxvii. 9, a prophecy found in Zechariah is attributed to Jeremiah. Zechariah xi. 9, however, is generally assigned not to Zechariah, but to some unknown prophet. It is to be noted that the name of the prophet is omitted in the ancient Syriac, the two earliest Latin MSS., and one of the oldest Greek uncials. The Old Syriac and the oldest Latin version may be dated early in the second century, if not in the first. It is therefore possible that the name may have been inserted from a copyist. But again, we find that in Luke xxiv. 44 the third division of the Old Testament. *Kethubim*, is called "the Psalms," the book of Psalms standing first in the collection. Now, in many ancient rolls Jeremiah, the longest of the prophetic books, occupied the first place; and the rolls might naturally take their names from the first and longest book. A quotation from any book in the collection might naturally appear as taken from "Jeremiah." From none of these instances nor from all of them together do we obtain evidence to prove the writer either unintelligent or uneducated.

Dr. Moffatt is impressed with "the massive unity of this book," and thinks that in xiii. 52 the writer unconsciously portrays himself. "He is a Jewish Christian, acquainted with rabbinic learning" (*Introduction to the Literature of the New Testament, I.T.L.*, pp. 244, 255). The style of Matthew Dr. James Morison found "charming . . . exquisitely simple and unvarnished" (*Comm. on Matt.*, p. vii.). "Comparing the first Gospel with the second, we find it to be, if not more elegant or more Hellenic, at least a great deal smoother and easier reading" (W. H. Simcox, *The Writers of the New Testament*, p. 9). It is altogether too good work to be done by a man destitute of intelligence and education.

It is therefore quite credible that our Lord spoke the words recorded in Matthew xii. 40. It is not impossible that He was crucified on a Thursday. Even if He were crucified on a Friday, with no "easy conviction that all Hebrew expressions for the lapse of time may mean anything you like," in accordance with Jewish methods of reckoning, the period spent by our Lord in the grave might be accurately described as "three days and three nights."

W. EWING.

INDEX.

PAGE

Rev. Professor Herbert T. Andrews, D.D.	
The Conception of the Gospel in the Synoptics	113
Rev. E. H. Askwith, D.D.	
The Hope of Immortality in the Psalter	74
Rev. Principal Sydney Cave, D.D.	
The Paradox of Religion : a Study of Otto's "The Holy"	100
Rev. Professor Archibald Duff, M.A., LL.D., D.D.	
The Rise of the Title "Messiah"	205
Rev. Frank Eakin, B.D., Ph.D.	
Mark's "Straightway"	185
Rev. W. Ewing, M.C., D.D.	
The Sign of Jonah	460
Rev. W. J. Ferrar, M.A.	
The Record of a Development	150
H. J. Flowers, B.A., B.D.	
Jesus and Baptism	447
The late Rev. Principal P. T. Forsyth, D.D.	
The Preaching of Jesus and the Gospel of Christ	288
Rev. A. T. S. James, M.A., M.Sc.	
The Reticence of Jesus	155
Rev. J. H. Leckie, D.D.	
The Teaching of John MacLeod Campbell	370
Rev. G. H. C. MacGregor, M.A.	
How Far is the Fourth Gospel a Unity ?	161
Professor J. R. Mantey, Theol.D.	
Unusual Meanings for Prepositions in the Greek New Testament	453
Rev. Professor D. S. Margoliouth, Litt.D., F.B.A.	
The Messiah	1

Professor Theophile James Meek, B.D., Ph.D	PAGE
Was Jeremiah a Priest ?	215
Rev. William Pierson Merrill, D.D.	
An Evolutionist at Calvary	260
Rev. Professor James Moffatt, D.D., Litt.D.	
In Memoriam : W. Robertson Nicoll	401
Rev. A. D. Mozley, M.A.	
Jewish Expectations as to the Date of Christ's Coming	238
John P. Naish, B.Litt., B.D.	
Fresh Light on the Book of Esther	56
Rev. D. Plooij, D.D.	
The Apostolic Decree and its Problems	21, 81, 223
Rev. A. M. Pope, B.D.	
Paul's Address before the Council at Jerusalem	426
Edith Anne Robertson and the Rev. Professor J. A. Robertson, M.A., D.D.	
Jesus Seeking the Lost	134
Jesus the Law Breaker	386
Rev. Professor G. A. Johnston Ross, D.D.	
The Epistle of the Torn Heart : a Note on 2 Corinthians	130
Rev. W. Huey Steele, M.A.	
Hosanna	398
Rev. S. Tonkin, B.D.	
Some Unlit Lamps	390
Rev. H. L. Townsend, B.D.	
The Gospel of Evidence	312
Rev. Professor Adam C. Welch, D.D.	
A Zealot Pamphlet	273
On the Present Position of Old Testament Criticism	344
Rev. W. R. Whately, M.A.	
The Feeding of the Four Thousand	139
The late Professor Owen C. Whitehouse, D.D.	
The Historical Background of the Deutero-Isaiah	241, 321, 405
Rev. Canon R. Winterbotham, M.A.	
The Sign of Jonah	67
H. G. Wood, M.A.	
Liberal Protestantism and Modernist Criticism	41

INDEX TO SUBJECTS.

	PAGE
A Zealot Pamphlet	273
An Evolutionist at Calvary	260
Apostolic Decree and its Problems, The 21, 81,	223
Baptism, Jesus and	447
Conception of the Gospel in the Synoptics, The	113
Date of Christ's Coming, Jewish Expectations of the	238
Deutero-Isaiah, The Historical Background of the 241, 321,	405
Epistle of the Torn Heart, The	130
Esther, Fresh Light on the Book of	56
Evolutionist at Calvary, An	260
Feeding of the Four Thousand, The	139
Gospel of Evidence, The	312
Historical Background of the Deutero-Isaiah, The 241, 321,	405
Hope of Immortality in the Psalter, The	74
Hosanna	398
How Far is the Fourth Gospel a Unity	161
In Memoriam: W. Robertson Nicoll	401
Jeremiah, Was he a Priest	215
Jesus and Baptism	447
Jesus Seeking the Lost	134
Jesus the Law Breaker	386
Jesus, The Preaching of	288
Jesus, The Reticence of	155
Jewish Expectations as to the Date of Christ's Coming	238

	PAGE
John MacLeod Campbell, The Teaching of	370
Jonah, The Sign of	67, 460
Liberal Protestantism and Modern- ist Criticism	41
Mark's "Straightway"	185
Messiah, The	1
"Messiah," The Rise of the Title	205
Nicoll, W. Robertson: In Memo- riam	401
Old Testament Criticism, On the Present Position of	344
Paradox of Religion, The: a Study of Otto's "The Holy"	100
Paul's Address before the Council at Jerusalem	426
Preaching of Jesus and the Gospel of Christ, The	288
Prepositions in the Greek New Testament, Unusual Meanings for	453
Record of a Development, The	150
Reticence of Jesus, The	155
Rise of the Title "Messiah," The	205
Sign of Jonah, The	67, 460
Some Unlit Lamps	390
"Straightway," Mark's	185
Teaching of John MacLeod Camp- bell, The	370
Unusual Meanings for Prepositions in the Greek N.T.	453
Zealot Pamphlet, A	273

INDEX TO TEXTS.

	PAGE		PAGE		PAGE
Gen. v. 24 . . .	79	Mark ii. 12 . . .	200	Mark xiv. 45 . . .	208
Ps. ii. 6, 7 . . .	326	ii. 18 . . .	457	xiv. 64 . . .	11
vi. 5 . . .	74	ii. 20 . . .	204	xiv. 72 . . .	200
xvi. 1-11 . . .	75	iii. 6 . . .	199	xv. 1 . . .	200
xvii. 1-15 . . .	76	iv. 5 . . .	200	xvi. 15 . . .	114
xvii. 1 . . .	207	iv. 15 . . .	200	x. 8 . . .	170
xvii. 23, 35, 36, 38,		iv. 16 . . .	200	xiii. 36-38 . . .	178
51 . . .	207	iv. 17 . . .	200	xv. 5, 6 . . .	170
xliv. 1-19 . . .	77-78	iv. 29 . . .	201	xvi. 31, 32 . . .	178
lxxiii. 1-28 . . .	79-80	v. 2 . . .	201	xvi. 33 . . .	178
cxv. 17 . . .	74	v. 29 . . .	200	xx. 31 . . .	312
Jerem. iii. 1 . . .	221	v. 30 . . .	201	Acts vii. 53 . . .	455
iii. 19 . . .	222	v. 42 . . .	200, 201	x. 38 . . .	14
vii. 22 . . .	220	vi. 25 . . .	200	xv. 4 . . .	453
Ezek. xxii. 25 . . .	218	vi. 27 . . .	200	xviii. 13 . . .	459
Matt. ii. 23 . . .	470	vi. 45 . . .	201	Rom. i. 16, 17 . . .	443
viii. 11 . . .	144	vi. 50 . . .	200	i. 26 . . .	459
viii. 34 . . .	456	vi. 54 . . .	201	ii. 29 . . .	443
xxi. 43 . . .	144	vii. 10 . . .	201	iii. 22 . . .	443
xxvi. 64 . . .	11	vii. 25 . . .	201	iii. 21-23 . . .	443
Mark i. 5 . . .	114	vii. 30 . . .	204	iv. 3, 9 . . .	455
i. 10 . . .	201	vii. 35 . . .	204	vi. 19 . . .	456
i. 12 . . .	201	viii. 31 . . .	204	x. 4 . . .	455
i. 18 . . .	199	viii. 35 . . .	114	xiv. 13 . . .	33
i. 20 . . .	201	ix. 15 . . .	201	xv. 2 . . .	455
i. 21 . . .	201	ix. 20 . . .	201	2 Cor. ii. 12 . . .	456
i. 23 . . .	201	ix. 24 . . .	200	Gal. v. 13 . . .	33
i. 28 . . .	200	x. 8 . . .	455	Eph. iii. 2 . . .	456
i. 29 . . .	201	x. 29 . . .	114	iv. 15 . . .	456
i. 30 . . .	201	x. 52 . . .	200	iv. 22 . . .	459
i. 31 . . .	204	xi. 2, 3 . . .	200	v. 32 . . .	455
i. 38 . . .	116	xi. 20 . . .	204	vi. 22 . . .	456
i. 42 . . .	200	xiii. 10 . . .	114	James i. 13 . . .	453
i. 43 . . .	201	xiv. 9 . . .	114		
ii. 8 . . .	201	xiv. 43 . . .	200		



GTU Library

3 2400 00276 5729

The Expositor

DEC 11 1904

MAR 13 1970

MAR 20 1970

1923:1

capac

50,8

1.25

1923:1

Expositor

